

Mass., favoring the construction of naval vessels at the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Iowa: Resolutions of Order of Railway Conductors, Eagle Grove Division, and Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Stuart, Iowa, urging the passage of the Hoar-Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Sioux City Lodge, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, favoring passage of more restrictive immigration laws—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TIRRELL: Resolution of board of aldermen of the city of Boston, Mass., favoring the construction of war vessels in the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of the Ministerial Union of Boston, Mass., against military expositions—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WACHTER: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Morris B. Slawson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARNER: Resolution of William T. Sherman Post, No. 146, Bloomington, Ill., Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the building of war vessels in the navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WOODS: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., urging the passage of House bill 10375, for the survey and construction of a free public wagon road into the Hetch-Hetchy Valley and thence into the Yosemite Valley—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., for the construction by the Government of a Pacific cable—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, March 8, 1902.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

THE RECORD.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Journal will stand as approved.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I desire to correct the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is it the RECORD or the Journal?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Then that will come after the approval of the Journal. Without objection, the Journal will stand as approved. The Chair hears none.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I desire to correct the RECORD on page 2509 of yesterday's proceedings. After I had concluded my remarks and was in the act of resuming my seat, I was interrupted by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON], and the following colloquy occurred:

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. How many carriers has the gentleman in his district?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I think there are 19. How many has the gentleman in his?

There, Mr. Speaker, the RECORD stops as printed this morning; but the gentleman from Indiana continued and answered the question thus:

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. None.

Now, that part is taken entirely out of the RECORD, and when the RECORD came to me last night by the carrier for the Public Printer I found the following changes were made in the colloquy:

How many carriers has the gentleman recommended in his district?

The word "recommended" being inserted in the question put to me puts an entirely different question to me, and if it had been asked I would have given an entirely different answer, because I have not recommended all the carriers that have been appointed in my district. Now, then, the final answer of the gentleman from Indiana, in which the word "none" appears in the stenographic report brought to me last night was stricken out entirely and in its stead the following language was inserted:

I have something like 50 routes, but no carriers to my credit.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I saw that those changes had been made, and the carrier said to me that Mr. ROBINSON desired to call the changes to my attention. I looked over it and saw how entirely the changes had varied the question, and that it put me in a different attitude from that in which I was really put by the question first put and answered by me, and I sent the gentleman this message, which I thought as kindly a one as I possibly could send, that as it was a colloquy between himself and myself, have it eliminated entirely from the RECORD or inserted entirely; but

instead of that only a part appears, and that is as I have just read, to wit:

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. How many carriers has the gentleman in his district?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I think there are 19. How many has the gentleman in his?

Now, the RECORD should stand as corrected:

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. None.

So that, Mr. Speaker, if there is to be construed an imputation upon the character of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES] that he is opposed to the present Loud bill in this House because he has a few carriers scattered over his illustrious district, carrying the mails to the honest farmers of his district, then a like imputation rests upon the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON], and in all justice, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the RECORD speak as I spoke; that the RECORD speak as he spoke; nothing more and nothing less.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Does this require unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER. It does not. The correction of the RECORD is privileged, but if the gentlemen do not agree in respect to it, a resolution of the House will have to be submitted.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. In view of the fact that the statement made does not correctly give the proceedings of yesterday, in which I am fortified by the statements of the stenographer who took the debate, that it does not either state the facts that occurred here, or the facts about which we were speaking in so far as I am concerned, then I shall object to the correction of the RECORD to read in that manner.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I had the stenographic report last night myself in my own hands and have quoted a copy of it in my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee must realize the fact that this is not a matter within the control of the presiding officer, and there is nothing before the House now unless he offers a resolution or makes a motion.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I make the motion that the RECORD stand as stenographically reported by the Reporter of this House, and that would put the word "none" in the RECORD as the answer of the gentleman from Indiana identically in the reply he made to me.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman had better reduce his motion to writing, so that there will be no controversy. If the gentleman is not ready he can draw it, and the Chair will permit some unanimous consents to come in.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I will do that, Mr. Speaker.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSOURI RIVER AT SOUTH OMAHA, NEBR.

Mr. MERCER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4607) to provide for the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River at or near South Omaha, Nebr.

The bill was read at length.

The amendments recommended by the committee were read at length.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The amendments recommended by the committee were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. MERCER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House was requested: S. 2533. An act to remove the charge of desertion against Frederick Schulte or Schuldt.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House of Representatives to concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. No. 12) to print 3,500 copies of the proceedings of the Schley Court of Inquiry, etc.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 11471. An act making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 2533. An act to remove the charge of desertion against Frederick Schulte, or Schuldt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2731. An act for the relief of Salvador Costa—to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 2082. An act granting an increase of pension to Louise Ward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2479. An act to facilitate the procurement of statistics of trade between the United States and its noncontiguous territory—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. 3651. An act appropriating the sum of \$3,000 a year for the support and maintenance of the permanent international commission of the congresses of navigation, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

WESTERN JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS.

Mr. DINSMORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 7458.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7458) to re-form the western judicial district of the State of Arkansas.

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of February 20, 1897, entitled "An act to re-organize the judicial districts of Arkansas, and for other purposes," be, and is hereby, so amended as to add to the western judicial district of the State of Arkansas as now formed the counties of Baxter, Marion, and Searcy, now a part of the eastern judicial district of said State.

SEC. 2. That in the said western district there is hereby formed a third division, which shall be known as the Harrison division.

SEC. 3. That all process, civil and criminal, hereafter issued against any person or persons residing in either of the counties of Baxter, Boone, Carroll, Madison, Marion, Newton, or Searcy, which counties shall constitute the Harrison division, shall be made returnable to the courts for the Harrison division, to be held at the city of Harrison.

All process, civil and criminal, now pending in the courts, respectively, at Fort Smith or at Batesville, against persons residing in any of the counties hereby incorporated in the Harrison division, shall be disposed of and determined in those courts, respectively.

SEC. 4. That the terms of the United States circuit and district courts for the Harrison division of the western judicial district of the State of Arkansas shall be held at Harrison, in the county of Boone, on the first Mondays in March and August.

SEC. 5. That there shall be appointed, in the manner required by law, a clerk, who shall keep his office at the city of Harrison.

SEC. 6. That all acts and parts of acts in conflict with this act be, and the same are hereby, repealed; and this act shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage.

The amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

Amend lines 12 and 13 by striking out the word "first" in line 12 and inserting "second," and strike out "March" and insert "April."

In line 13 strike out "August" and insert "October."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. DINSMORE, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk. The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency be authorized to have printed and bound such matter for the use of said committee as it may deem necessary in connection with subjects considered or to be considered by said committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would ask the gentleman from New Jersey if that resolution is in the usual form and limits the amount of printing to \$500?

Mr. FOWLER. I did not hear the gentleman's question.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does the resolution offered by the gentleman limit the expenditure for printing to \$500, the limitation applied by the rules?

Mr. FOWLER. There is no limitation here, but I do not apprehend that it will be any considerable portion of \$500. It is the ordinary printing for the committee's own purposes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is what I wanted to know.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken; and the resolution was agreed to.

SPANISH CLAIMS COMMISSION.

Mr. RAY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report. I ask unanimous consent to omit the reading of the report itself and read the statement.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York presents a conference report and asks unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the report and that the statement be read. Without objection, that course will be pursued.

The conference report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8586) amending the act of March 2, 1901, entitled "An act to carry into effect the stipulations of article 7 of the treaty between the United States and Spain, concluded on the 10th

day of December, 1898," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

The Senate recedes from its amendment to the House bill, and agrees to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That section 4 of the act entitled 'An act to carry into effect the stipulations of article 7 of the treaty between the United States and Spain, concluded on the 10th day of December, 1898,' approved March 2, 1901, is hereby amended by adding thereto the following provisions:

"Such rules and mode of procedure shall conform, so far as practicable, to the mode of procedure and practice of the circuit courts of the United States. The said Commission created by this act is vested with the same powers now possessed by the circuit and district courts of the United States to compel the attendance and testimony of parties, claimants and witnesses, to preserve order, and to punish for contempt, and to compel the production of any books or papers deemed material to the consideration of any claim or matter pending before said Commission.

"That the said Commission is also vested with all the powers now possessed by the circuit and district courts of the United States to take or procure testimony in foreign countries. Such testimony may be taken, pursuant to the provisions of existing laws and the rules and practice of the district and circuit courts of the United States, so far as applicable, before the Commission or any commissioner or commissioners appointed under the provisions of this act.

"That the marshal of the United States for the District of Columbia or his deputies shall serve all processes issued by said Commission, preserve order in the place of sitting, and execute the orders of said Commission; and outside of the District of Columbia the writs of said Commission shall be executed by United States marshals or their deputies in their respective districts.

"That said Commission or any commissioner appointed by it to take testimony in foreign countries is hereby authorized to appoint an officer to serve any subpoena or process issued by said Commission or commissioner.

"When testimony is to be taken before any commissioner appointed by said Commission within any district or Territory, the clerk of any court of the United States for such district or Territory shall, on application of either party or of his agent, issue a subpoena for such witness, commanding him to appear and testify before the commissioner at a time and place stated in the subpoena; and if any witness, after being duly served with such subpoena, refuses or neglects to appear, or after appearing refuses to testify, not being privileged from giving testimony, and such refusal or neglect is proven to the satisfaction of any judge of the court whose clerk issues the subpoena, such judge may proceed to enforce obedience to the process or punish the disobedience, as any court of the United States may proceed in case of disobedience to process of subpoena to testify issued by such court; and the production before such commissioner of any paper or writing, written instrument, book, or other document may also be required in the manner prescribed in section 889 of the Revised Statutes of the United States."

The House recedes from its nonconcurrence with the Senate amendments and agrees to the same with amendments as above set forth and stated.

GEO. W. RAY,

JOHN J. JENKINS,

S. W. T. LANHAM,

Managers on the part of the House.

S. M. CULLOM,

H. C. LODGE,

JNO. T. MORGAN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement was read, as follows:

Statement to accompany conference report on the disagreeing vote of the two Houses on the bill H. R. 8586, "An act amending the act of March 2, 1901, entitled 'An act to carry into effect the stipulations of article 7 of the treaty between the United States and Spain concluded on the 10th day of December, 1898.'"

The amendment of the Senate struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted new provisions, and also amended the title in such a manner as to make an entirely new and independent act.

The amendments agreed upon restore the title of the bill, so as to make the action of the two Houses, if agreed to by the respective bodies, an amendment to the original act creating the Spanish Treaty Claims Commission, and accomplishes the purposes sought to be established by both Houses, viz:

1. The amendment as agreed upon makes the rules and mode of procedure authorized by the original act conform, so far as practicable, to the mode of procedure and practice of the circuit courts of the United States.

2. Power is conferred upon the said Commission, the same as now possessed by the circuit and district courts of the United States, to compel the attendance and testimony of parties, claimants and witnesses; to preserve order and punish for contempt committed in the presence of the Commission, and to compel the production of books and papers material to the consideration of the matter pending before the Commission.

3. The Commission is also authorized and empowered to take testimony in foreign countries, and to that end is vested with the powers possessed by the circuit and district courts of the United States, and such testimony is to be taken before the Commission or commissioners appointed by it pursuant to the provisions of existing law and the rules and practice of said courts.

4. The marshal of the District of Columbia is to execute process issued by the Commission in said District, and the marshals and deputy marshals of the United States are to execute process without the District of Columbia, and in foreign countries the Commission or commissioners may designate some suitable person to serve such process.

5. When testimony in the United States or any district or Territory thereof is to be taken without the District of Columbia, the clerk of the United States court in the district where the testimony is to be taken is to issue the subpoena, and if the witness neglects or fails or refuses to appear or to testify after appearing, such contempt is to be reported to the court from which the subpoena issued and such court proceeds to punish for the contempt or disobedience.

6. The amendments and bill as agreed upon substantially removes the objections heretofore urged against vesting the Commission with the power to punish for contempts, and confers power upon the Commission to procure testimony necessary to the matters pending before it in all the States and in all the Territories of the United States and in foreign countries. No power is conferred not now possessed by the circuit and district courts of the United States except the designation of a commissioner authorized by the act to take testimony in foreign countries.

GEO. W. RAY,

JOHN J. JENKINS,

S. W. T. LANHAM,

Conferees on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, this conference report is on a matter that led to a considerable discussion when the original question was before the House. The form of the proposition in the conference report is perhaps clear to those who have fully studied it, but I for one would like to hear some explanation from the chairman as to how it affects the constitutional difficulties that were suggested when the bill was formerly before the House. It was a matter on which the House was very evenly divided, or nearly equally divided, and the idea of the Committee on the Judiciary was that the constitutional questions could be avoided that were involved in the bill as discussed at that time.

Mr. RAY of New York. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. BARTLETT. Before the gentleman proceeds I should like him to answer this question also. I do not see anything in this conference report, which virtually reports a new bill, which provides for the payment of the witnesses. Your bill provides that all the testimony in the United States shall be taken before the clerk of a circuit court.

Mr. RAY of New York. It provides what?

Mr. BARTLETT. For the taking of testimony in the United States of people who do not live in the District of Columbia before the clerk of the circuit court.

Mr. RAY of New York. Oh, no; the gentleman is entirely mistaken.

Mr. BARTLETT. I so understood it, but I may not have caught it correctly. In other words, it provides that the clerk of the circuit court shall issue the subpoena to compel the attendance of witnesses before the tribunal which is to take the testimony. I think I state that correctly.

Mr. RAY of New York. That is right.

Mr. BARTLETT. Now, if you locate the commission to take this testimony in cities or towns where a circuit court is held, then you necessarily compel the witnesses sometimes in my State to go as much as 100 or 150 miles in order to give that testimony, and if they do not go they are subject to process for contempt provided for in this bill.

Mr. RAY of New York. It is not provided in this bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. Ought you not to provide some means of paying these parties who are compelled to come and testify for the Government, or for the party suing the Government, who are compelled under this process to testify at the risk of being subject to contempt proceedings if they violate the subpoena?

Mr. RAY of New York. We do not need to put it in here. Mr. Speaker, the provisions here are simply an amendment to section 4 of the original bill creating the Spanish War Claims Commission. The Commission found itself without power to take testimony in foreign countries at all; without power to take testimony in the island of Cuba, where the most of the witnesses will be found, although some of them may be in Spain. It will be impossible for either side to bring these witnesses to the United States to give testimony in the great majority of instances.

Now, the original bill and the general law provide in terms for procuring witnesses, and of course paying witnesses, under the terms of the existing law; and no witness will be compelled to attend either in behalf of the Government or in behalf of the claimant without payment of fees provided for witnesses.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I interrupt the gentleman again?

Mr. RAY of New York. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. As I caught the reading of the conference report, it strikes out all of the original bill passed by the House and substitutes the Senate bill.

Mr. RAY of New York. Oh, no; the gentleman did not hear correctly. Now, the Senate struck out all of the House bill and inserted new provisions. The Senate amended the title, substituting a title of its own, so that they had an entirely independent act, and did not purport to amend the original act.

Now, the House did not agree to that. We did not undertake new and independent legislation, and this statement that has been read simply explains what the Senate did originally in that regard, and it is set forth in the statement that that action has been changed by the conference. We have restored the provisions of the House bill with certain modifications, and we have restored the title that was in the House bill, so that the amendments agreed upon by the conference committee are substantially the House bill with modifications, and with some provisions proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement is this: The rules that were authorized by the original act are to be made by this Commission in conformity to, so far as possible, the rules and practice in the circuit and district courts of the United States, so that the practice before this Commission will be the same as the practice in the circuit courts of the United States. That is certainly wise and proper.

The next provision is one that will enable this Commission to maintain order here where it sits in the city of Washington, and to punish contempt committed in the presence of the Commission—a necessary power—or else it could not hold orderly sessions.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman whether the bill as amended by the conference report does not authorize this Commission to issue subpoenas to enforce attendance of witnesses by process of contempt?

Mr. RAY of New York. I was coming to that. We expressly provide, in lieu of what was in the House bill before, that all process for witnesses shall be issued by the clerk of the district or circuit courts of the United States, or the Territorial court, if it be such, and that if the witness fails or neglects or refuses to appear and testify, that the punishment for the contempt shall be in the court issuing the subpoena. In the District of Columbia it would be in the United States courts here; in the Territories it would be in the United States courts there; in the State it would be the district court of the United States for the district in which the subpoena issues. We did that in order to obviate and remove, so far as possible, the objections that are raised here.

Mr. LACEY. That is the identical question I wanted to hear my friend about. I wish he would read that part of the bill as the conference committee have agreed upon it, for I would like to see if it obviates the difficulties that we were discussing the other day when the bill was up.

Mr. RAY of New York (reading):

When testimony is to be taken before any commissioner appointed by said Commission within any district or Territory the clerk of any court of the United States for such district or Territory shall, on application of either party or his agent, issue a subpoena for such witness, commanding him to appear and testify before the Commission at a time and place stated in the subpoena; and if any witness after being duly served with such subpoena refuses or neglects to appear or, after appearing, refuses to testify, not being privileged from giving testimony, and such refusal or neglect is proven to the satisfaction of any judge of the court whose clerk issued the subpoena, such judge may proceed to enforce obedience to the process or punish the disobedience as any court of the United States may proceed in cases of disobedience to process of subpoena to testify issued by said court, and the production before such commissioner of any paper or writing, written instrument, book, or other document may also be required in the manner prescribed in section 893 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

Mr. LACEY. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. RAY of New York. Yes.

Mr. LACEY. That does not answer my question; that only provides as to testimony to be taken outside of the Commission. I want to know, and would like to have the gentleman point out that part of the proposed measure which provides for taking testimony before the Commission and the disobedience of the subpoena issued by the Commission itself.

Mr. RAY of New York. Well, I have already stated that; but I will read the provision. The Commission sits here in the District of Columbia. Section 4, which is amended, provides for the making of rules and regulations by the Commission. It did not provide what those rules and regulations should be; that part of the bill is therefore amended as to the rules in this manner:

Such rules and mode of procedure shall conform, so far as practicable, to the mode of procedure and practice of the circuit courts of the United States. The said Commission created by this act is vested with the same powers now possessed by the circuit and district courts of the United States to compel the attendance and testimony of parties, claimants, and witnesses, to preserve order, and to punish for contempt, and to compel the production of any books or papers deemed material to the consideration of any claim or matter pending before said Commission.

That the said Commission is also vested with all the powers now possessed by the circuit and district courts of the United States to take or procure testimony in foreign countries. Such testimony may be taken, pursuant to the provisions of existing laws and the rules and practice of the district and circuit courts of the United States, so far as applicable, before the Commission or any commissioner or commissioners appointed under the provisions of this act.

Now, we have provided (and I have read the later provision) that wherever a subpoena is issued to compel the attendance of witnesses, it must be issued by the clerk of the United States court in the District of Columbia or elsewhere; and the power of punishment in that regard is vested in the court. But the Commission itself may punish for contempts committed in its immediate presence and may keep order. There is no possible constitutional or other objection to that, because the Constitution says that we may create tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court, and the decisions of the Supreme Court are to the effect that we may vest these inferior tribunals with the power of those courts. But we have so limited the power that this Commission may simply keep order and punish contempts committed in its immediate presence. Witnesses are compelled to attend by the courts of the United States, and if there be contempt in regard to the matter the United States courts will provide for it.

Mr. LACEY. Will the gentleman yield to me for five minutes?

Mr. RAY of New York. I will yield to the gentleman, but I want to retain the floor.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, this question is one that was discussed perhaps a couple of weeks ago, the gentlemen from Massachusetts [Mr. Moody] and myself calling the attention of the Committee on the Judiciary to the very doubtful constitutional authority to enact certain portions of this bill, and also the doubtful propriety of enacting them even if the constitutional right existed. A part of the objection raised at that time has been met

by amendments; another part of the objection still remains in the proposition of the conference committee, and that is this: That Commission is vested with the power to issue subpoenas and to enforce attendance of witnesses and to have the general powers with reference to contempt ordinarily vested in a court. In these days when the question of a power, the extreme power of the courts to issue the process of injunction and to follow that process up by proceedings for contempt in all sorts of controversies, is the subject of general dispute, and Congress is appealed to to enact legislation to limit these powers in the Federal courts, we are met by this proposition of the conference committee to enlarge the powers of a mere commission and give them the authority to issue subpoenas and to arrest for contempt.

Heretofore in matters of this kind the powers of these commissions and of tribunals that are not courts have been limited. Such tribunals have been vested with power to issue subpoenas, and in case of disobedience to a subpoena that constitutes a misdemeanor, and the party charged with such an offense is entitled to his day in court. In this case it is proposed to give to this mere Commission—a board of arbitration substantially—the powers of a court as to contempt.

Mr. LANHAM. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. LACEY. Certainly.

Mr. LANHAM. Do you not think that this Commission is a tribunal under all proper construction and by constitutional authority?

Mr. LACEY. I do not think it is a tribunal within the meaning of the Constitution, because the Constitution provides for "tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court." Now, this is not "inferior to the Supreme Court." In a certain sense it is superior to it. At least it is independent of it.

Mr. LANHAM. Oh, no.

Mr. LACEY. It is substantially above all the courts; it is a tribunal in and of itself with the final right to settle these questions. It is not given the authority of a court in the broad sense of creating a tribunal or a court. There is no writ of error from this court to the Supreme Court of the United States. It is a commission, as the Interstate Commerce Commission is a commission. It is a commission organized just as any other commissions are, merely for the purpose of investigating and reporting upon certain things. Imagine the Industrial Commission issuing warrants of commitment for contempt!

Now, as to the power to enforce attendance before a tribunal or commission of this character, I think we ought to draw the line and not give this Commission the power of committing for contempt. The power to compel the attendance of witnesses—to enforce their attendance by indictment as for misdemeanor in violating a subpoena—ought to be given just as it is given to courts-martial or Congressional committees. A court-martial can summon a private citizen who is not an enlisted man or an officer of the Army. If he disobeys the subpoena the court-martial can not bring him up for contempt. But he can be punished by a court for a misdemeanor. The proposition here would be in a case like that to give the court-martial power to punish a citizen for contempt. We refuse to do that; we merely provide that in case of a citizen refusing to obey the subpoena he may be indicted and punished in the courts and may have his day in court, instead of having his day in a court-martial. We are unwilling to trust a court-martial with these high powers to arrest and imprison a citizen, and we ought not to trust it to a mere commission such as this is. I think it is a mistake to accept this proposition in the form it is set out in the conference report. I call the attention of the House to it, and in doing so I believe I have done my duty, whatever the result may be.

Mr. WARNOCK. Will the gentleman [Mr. LACEY] yield for one question?

Mr. LACEY. Certainly.

Mr. WARNOCK. Suppose this Commission has no power to compel the attendance of witnesses, would not that leave all their investigations practically ex parte?

Mr. LACEY. Not at all. I am not suggesting they should have no power. It is the method as to how to get at it. We had the question up the other day as to the power of the receiver and register in the land office to bring witnesses before them. They have the power to issue subpoenas, but no power to punish for contempt.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LACEY. Just a minute more to answer the question.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY] yield?

Mr. RAY of New York. I yield a minute more.

Mr. LACEY. Just long enough to answer the question.

Mr. WARNOCK. Yes; I would like to know.

Mr. LACEY. And instead of authorizing the receiver or register to punish for contempt the action of witnesses in refusing to appear it becomes a misdemeanor and they are punished by in-

dictment, just as though they refused to appear before a Congressional committee. The committee can not punish a man for contempt, but the courts will punish him. This authority ought to be given to the courts and not to the Commission, and you get the witnesses, but get them in a way by which their rights are protected by proceedings in courts of justice.

Mr. RAY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman misrepresents to the House the conference report, not that he intends to, but simply because he does not understand it. When we had the matter here before, gentlemen objected because it was said the power to punish for contempt ought to be relegated in a matter such as this to the circuit and district courts of the United States. Now, the House voted their proposition down more than two to one, but still we thought that if we could avoid that objection on the part of any member that we would do it; so the Senate and the House conferees unanimously have eliminated the power of this Commission to punish for contempt except in certain cases, to issue subpoenas, and have provided that the subpoenas shall be issued by the clerk of the court, and that when there is any contempt committed, that the contempt shall be punished under the laws of the United States in the court and by the court issuing the subpoena. Now, I hope that will settle that matter.

We also provide for the taking of testimony in foreign countries, and there will be no power to punish for contempt there. We do provide that this Commission shall have the power of the district and circuit courts of the United States, and that it may punish contempt in its presence, because we provide for the keeping of order by the Commission where they hold their sessions here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. LACEY rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. RAY of New York. I have given the gentleman his time.

Mr. LACEY. But, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman says that I misrepresent a proposition, when I try to get information from him.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. RAY of New York. Why, I yield to a question.

Mr. LACEY. If the gentleman's statement is correct, I have no objection to this bill. I have tried to find out from him what particular provision there was in relation to the issuance of subpoenas through the Commission in Washington, and whether or not the process of contempt would issue from that Commission in case of violation of the subpoena.

Mr. RAY of New York. There is not a word in this amendment about the Commission issuing subpoenas. There is a provision in it that the clerk of the United States court shall issue subpoenas. Now, I have asserted that five or six times, I have read it, and I trust the gentleman understands it.

Mr. LACEY. Well, if the gentleman will point out that paragraph or part of it which authorizes the clerk of the district court of the District of Columbia or the circuit court to issue subpoenas for the Commission sitting in the District, and enlighten my ignorance upon that question, I will be glad to have him do it. This is a conference report, and there is no need for any feeling upon the subject. The gentleman is here to give us light, and I suppose I have a right to ask him for it without being lectured.

Mr. RAY of New York. Why, certainly, and I am glad to give it, but I do not want the gentleman to ask me to point him to a provision of the amendment to the original act which is not in the act, and which is not in the amendments proposed by the conference. He asks me to point out the provision where this Commission is authorized to issue subpoenas, and I tell him over and over again that there is nothing of the kind either in the amendment agreed to or in the House bill, but that we do provide that the clerk of the United States court in the District shall issue the subpoenas, and that the court itself shall punish the contempts. The clause reads, as I remember, "in any district or Territory."

Mr. LANHAM. Let us have a vote; that is enough.

Mr. RAY of New York. Now, then, both the Democrats and Republicans on the committee—both Senate and House members—are all agreed. No power is invaded that should belong to the courts, nor is the liberty of any citizen endangered, and I trust that the conference report will be agreed to. If it is in order, I would like to move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 11728) to classify the rural free-delivery service and fix the compensation of the employees thereof.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SIMS. My statement has reference to the report of the committee of conference on House bill 10308, for the establishment of a permanent Census Bureau. A bill was brought into this House, Mr. Speaker, for making the Bureau permanent, and it was recommitted to the Select Committee on the Census with special instructions as to the bill they should frame, a part of which special instructions was this:

And with a provision therein to place the present employees within the classified service.

A bill was brought in, in response to that instruction, containing this section:

SEC. 5. That all employees of the Twelfth Census Office at the date of the passage of this act above the grade of skilled laborer shall be, and are hereby, placed under the provisions of the civil-service act approved January 16, 1883, and the amendments thereto and the rules established thereunder; and all new appointments in the Census Office hereby created shall be made in accordance with the requirements of the civil-service act above referred to.

The bill passed exactly in that form. It went to the Senate and that section was amended, not by striking out any word, but by adding these words—

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, I think too much time has been consumed already.

Mr. SIMS. I only ask for five or ten minutes; that is all it will take.

Mr. LOUD. I shall have to object. I make the point of order that this is not a question of privilege. If it is, it is an ex post facto privilege. It is something that has been disposed of by Congress. The bill has become a law. I have already yielded an hour this morning.

Mr. SIMS. The statement of privilege that I have to make is, that the House was misled and deceived by the statement of the chairman of the Select Committee on the Census and by the report of the conference committee, and I was proceeding to show that fact. The Senate added only, at the end of line 14, and the beginning of line 15, "without further examination," and at the end of line 18, "to the clerical force." That amendment came over with the others, was nonconcurrent in, and went to conference. I insist the conference committee had no right to strike out any part of the text of the section, except as to the Senate amendment, which in no way changed the meaning and intent of the section, but was merely an addition to the section in the way of phraseology.

The SPEAKER. The point of order has been made by the gentleman from California that this is not a question of privilege, because the matter has been disposed of by the House. There is no question but what this would have been a proper matter, possibly, to have considered when the conference report was before the House, because the report was before the House and was read.

Mr. SIMS. No; it was not read, and that is the very thing I wanted to show. The statement only was read.

The SPEAKER. The report was not read, but the statement was read only, and it is clearly not a matter of privilege to any member of the House. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

THE RECORD.

Mr. SWANSON. Pending that, Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a request for unanimous consent about a matter that would save some time.

The SPEAKER. In respect to what matter?

Mr. SWANSON. In respect to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON].

The SPEAKER. A correction of the RECORD?

Mr. SWANSON. A correction of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. That is a privileged matter. The gentleman will submit his request.

Mr. SWANSON. I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD be made to read in this way, and it has been agreed to by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES]: After the answer of the gentleman from Tennessee, "I think there are 19. How many has the gentleman in his?" The stenographer did not get all Mr. ROBINSON said in that connection, and consequently what he did take was misleading; and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] agree that the following be inserted as Mr. ROBINSON's reply, which explains fully what he intended to say:

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. None to my credit—no carrier; but I have about 50 routes in my district.

I ask unanimous consent, in behalf of both of those gentlemen, that this be inserted.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, that order will be made. There was no objection.

RURAL FREE-DELIVERY SERVICE.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California, that the House resolve itself into the Com-

mittee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 11728.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. GILLETTE of Massachusetts in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 11728.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, a large amount of irrelevant matter has been injected into this debate from its beginning down to the present moment. I shall not charge all of it to one side, because upon the injection of irrelevant matter upon one side or the other it is sometimes necessary in reply to bring in other irrelevant matters. I shall not attempt to do more in the time allotted me than to answer, as far as I can, a few of the objections urged against it. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS], in his argument against this bill a few days ago indulged in an unwarranted, gratuitous, and inexcusable attack upon the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

The truth is, his entire speech was directed so consistently against the committee and its chairman as to make it appear that perhaps the gentleman had some personal grievance in his breast, either against the committee as a whole or against the distinguished chairman of the committee. The gentleman says that the members of this committee—"genial, accommodating gentlemen, have been overpersuaded by the gentleman from California." I want to say to the gentleman from Indiana that, barring one member of that committee, every single gentleman on it is as honest, as courageous, as capable, and as intelligent as the gentleman from Indiana; and I do not know if I would not be justified in going a little further.

I knew a man once who had some trouble with a party of gentlemen in the smoker of a sleeping car. He knew all of the party but one. After his little difference with these gentlemen he left the smoker; but, thinking over his wrongs, a little later he returned, stuck his head in the door, and said: "Gentlemen, barring the stranger, you may all go to the devil." He went back, and after brooding a little further over it, he returned to the smoker and announced, "Gentlemen, I don't bar anybody; the entire party, stranger and all, can go." [Laughter.] I do not believe I will bar any member of the committee. That committee is composed of men who are as faithful, as earnest, as true, as honest, and as capable as the gentleman from Indiana.

I have heard of a preacher who once went to a town and a committee from the church called on him before the day on which he was to preach. One gentleman said to him, "Don't say too much about swearing in your sermon to-morrow, because Brother So-and-so sometimes indulges in swearing." Another brother said, "Don't indulge in too strong declamation against strong drink, because we have some brethren who are addicted sometimes to that habit, but who are otherwise good men."

And so brother after brother came until the category of crime and sin had been gone over, and he had been advised not to talk against anything. Finally he said to a brother, "I am advised not to talk against this, and not to talk against that, until I have left nothing to talk about. What shall I say?" The good brother, after cogitating a while, replied: "Well, I don't know; you might go for the Jews; they haven't got a friend in town." [Laughter.]

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] must have proceeded upon the presumption that the Post-Office Committee and its distinguished chairman probably had not a friend in the House, and attacked them without gloves. [Laughter.] He did not touch upon the bill. The fact is, he knows nothing about what is in the bill and less about the free rural-delivery service. He says that this service was instituted four years ago, when every gentleman on this floor who has paid the slightest attention to the service knows that it was instituted under the Postmaster-Generalship of Mr. Wilson. It was increased four years ago, and it was increased upon the recommendation and by the support and vote of these very gentlemen who have been denounced in this House as unfriendly to the rural delivery.

Ah, Mr. Chairman, there was a time, and I remember it well, when even the pulchritudinous gentleman from Indiana was not ready to jump into the breach in defense of this service and the defense of its administration. Two years ago the great Appropriations Committee of this House came in here with a deficiency that had been created in this service by this administration—by these very gentlemen whom they are now so anxious to defend, and criticised them severely for having spent \$150,000 more than had been appropriated.

What happened? Where was the gentleman from Indiana then, when this great Appropriations Committee with a unanimous report proposed that Congress say to the Post-Office Department that

no money shall hereafter be spent on this service unless it has been already appropriated? When that report came in and appeared as if it was going through this House without a word in defense of the administration, without a word from anyone in defense of the service, it was left to me, a Democrat from the wilds of Georgia, to defend the Republican First Assistant Postmaster-General, who hailed from the State of Indiana. [Laughter.]

Where was the gentleman from Indiana then? I judge from the tenor of his remarks the other day that he was waiting to be assured that the service was popular before placing himself at the head of the cohorts and indulging himself in the pleasant belief that he is the savior of the rural delivery. He does not claim, as he so facetiously charged against my friend from California, to be its "papa," but its savior. [Laughter.] "I have saved this service for the farmer boys in the country. I have lighted the fires upon the hearths of the farmers of Indiana." He is not the papa of this service, that is true. But, my friend, before you assume to be its savior, first inform yourself of the conditions surrounding its establishment and surrounding its progress during the last five years.

Now, I do not believe there is a single, solitary man in this House, I do not believe my friend from Indiana believes that there is any hostility to the rural delivery service on the Post-Office Committee. I do not believe there are a dozen men in the House of Representatives, be they from city or country, who would put one single block in the way of its final glorious success. We know it is a success, and we fought for it in its infancy. We sat by its cradle and rocked it when it was young, when the gentleman from Indiana and some other gentlemen who are assuming to be its saviors here to-day were either not conscious of its existence or were somewhere else looking after other cradles. [Laughter.]

My friend from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] made a strong argument against the bill from his standpoint, inveighing against the danger of change. He says we would revolutionize this service, and therefore put it in danger of destruction. Why, nobody knows better than the gentleman from Virginia that this service is here to stay, and that no bill simply applying to the details of the administration can even affect it unfavorably, much less destroy it. My friend from Virginia is too conservative. I was struck the other day by a definition of conservatism given by my colleague, Mr. HOWARD, in a cloakroom talk.

My friend said, "Conservatism is a cube with its corners cut off and its edges trimmed, so that it might be ready to roll in whatever direction necessity might demand." [Laughter.] That, Mr. Chairman, represents in very large part the conservatism in the House in reference to this particular bill. This great show of conservatism is a cube rounded and smoothed in order that it may go in whatever direction, in the argument against this bill, may be necessary to secure its defeat.

My friend from Virginia, after opposing this change because of its revolutionary tendencies, because of his fear that it would destroy the system, defends in the next breath a complete revolution that was effected the 1st of February last in the appointment of carriers and which has not yet been tested anywhere in the country. He is afraid of change when the committee proposes a change that it presents simply as a business proposition and believes will redound to the best interests of the service; but when a change is made by the Department the gentleman defends that revolution and attacks the other. His reason, and his principal reason, as it appears from his argument, is that he is afraid of the result of the change—afraid of the destruction it might visit upon the entire rural-delivery service.

Another great argument of most of the opponents of this bill is the frauds in the star-route service twenty-five or thirty years ago. Why should gentlemen go back to ancient history? Why should they go back to frauds committed, tried, punished, and ended thirty years ago, in order to attack not a service, but the administration of a service. This is not an effort to make the rural delivery a star-route service. It is simply an effort on the part of this committee to make the rural-delivery system the most effective rural-delivery service in their power, to enable the Government to extend it over the entire country. This opposition is based entirely on the supposed similarity of the proposed service to the former star-route service, to which I shall refer again later on.

Gentlemen say, "Why not put postmasters under the contract system?" Seventy thousand fourth-class postmasters in the United States are now practically under the contract system. They hold their positions by appointment, but their pay is graduated according to their cancellation of stamps. They are paid no fixed salaries, but in accordance with the service performed.

Yet gentlemen say we must make a salary for the rural carriers, a salary which shall be applicable alike in Maine and Florida; applicable alike in the Rocky Mountains of Colorado and on the plains of Indiana. It is impossible, gentlemen, to do it. It is

impossible so to regulate this salary as to make it equitable and just to the people as well as the carriers without in some way graduating it to meet the difficulties of different routes situated in widely separated sections of the country.

That being true, this committee, without any idea of injuring this service, without any idea of decreasing its efficiency in the slightest degree, sought earnestly and long for some method of so arranging the pay for carriers that the rural free-delivery service might be extended everywhere, that it might be extended to the remotest recesses of the country, that it might be extended into corners where it is impossible to extend it under the present regulations, with routes of the prescribed length and with the prescribed number of families, in order that all the people, no matter where they live, whether in the valleys or in the mountains, on the plains or in the hills, might enjoy the benefits of this service.

It appeared that great inequality of service existed everywhere, not only in Congressional districts but in every county, and we thought the best and most feasible plan of enabling the Department to extend this service everywhere was to submit the contract to competition and let the carriers bid on it.

I had the pleasure of listening the other day to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. THAYER], and I am sorry he is not now in his seat—the gentleman from "God's country," as he styles himself. The gentleman places the friends of rural delivery against and its enemies for the bill. I had the pleasure of coming to Congress one session before my distinguished friend from Massachusetts.

I say I had the pleasure, because it gave me the opportunity of meeting one man from the Worcester district who was broad enough and big enough to believe that God's beneficence extended to the limits of the universe and was not confined entirely to the Worcester district of the State of Massachusetts. I met a gentleman, Republican though he was, who believed that the sun shines and the rains fall in some other sections west and south of the Worcester district of Massachusetts.

The gentleman said that when he looked at the conveyances used for carrying the mails in the star-route service from Worcester to somewhere out in his county it made him blush—not with the maiden blush of modesty, but the ancient but honorable blush of shame. My friend from Massachusetts, as was suggested yesterday by my friend from Missouri, blushes too easily. In his description of "God's country" he said that less than a dollar and a half or a dollar and seventy-five cents a day is considered pauper wages in the Worcester district of Massachusetts, and that it has been impossible to get a man to carry the mails on a rural route at a salary of five hundred a year.

Yet in the very next breath he tells us that he blushed with shame on beholding the star-route service from Worcester to some point near by in that district. Nobody to work for \$1.50 a day! And yet men in the star-route service, according to my friend, were working for very much less than \$1.50 a day. I can not reconcile the two positions. If it is impossible to get men to work for \$500 a year in the Worcester district, it seems to me it would be impossible to get men to take contracts at less than that price in the Worcester district.

Gentlemen talk about the discrimination this committee would make between the city and the country communities in this matter. The committee does not propose to make any discrimination between the two. We propose, as far as we can, to give the country people the very best service that the United States is able to give them. We are not going to be put in the position of being in favor of extending facilities to the people in cities and not being willing to extend the same facilities to the people in the country.

It has been upon the report of this committee, it has been by the work of this committee, that every increase in the rural free-delivery service has been made, and I think I am not violating a confidence as a member of that committee when I say that at one time the Post-Office Department recommended in its estimate a million dollars for rural delivery. The subcommittee, after consultation with the head of this bureau, thought that a million and a half would be necessary—a half million more than had been estimated for—and upon the motion of the gentleman from Georgia, who, with other gentlemen on the floor of this House, has been charged with being in a collusion to destroy rural mail delivery, it was on a motion of mine that this amount was increased to \$1,750,000, and there was not an opposing vote in the committee.

We are as good friends of rural delivery as you gentlemen; we have worked for rural delivery as well as you gentlemen, but we recognize some obligation to all the people of the United States. We recognize the fact that with an estimated force of from 45,000 to 50,000 carriers, at the present salary of \$600 a year, this service will soon cost \$30,000,000.

Recognizing that fact, and knowing from experience that we shall never be able to keep their salaries at that figure—and I do not believe that any gentleman wishes to hold these salaries so

low—knowing that it can not be done, we recognized the fact that within six years, according to the Department estimate, there will be from 45,000 to 50,000 carriers, at a salary of at least \$700 to \$900 a year; it will require an appropriation of \$40,000,000 to keep up this service.

Mr. HILL. I will ask the gentleman, does not the Department in making that estimate largely increase the number by including in the estimate foot carriers on shorter routes at a greatly reduced cost from that of the mounted carrier, and in that way bring the number up, and has not the gentleman in making his estimate of \$30,000,000 entirely left out the saving which would be made by abolishing star routes and abolishing fourth-class offices, and entirely forgotten the increase of the service, and the consequent increase of receipts, which would go far toward cutting down the \$30,000,000 of which the gentleman spoke?

Mr. GRIGGS. I am very glad that my friend from Connecticut called my attention to that point at this particular time. In reply to his first question I will say that I do not know, because it is the first I have ever heard of foot service by the rural carriers.

Mr. HILL. I mean on the short routes.

Mr. GRIGGS. Yes; I understand you; but you can not make a route less than 10 or 15 miles through the country, and you can not get white men in the United States to take the job of walking around through the country to deliver mail. They will do it on the paved streets in the cities, but they will not do it in the country. The Department says, in reply this morning to the inquiry of my colleague [Mr. BOUTELL]:

We estimate that the territory available for rural free delivery will require from 45,000 to 50,000 routes, and that it will take six years to put it in.

That is the estimate of the Department. The gentleman asks if I have left out of this calculation the saving in the abolition of star routes. Yes; and if my friend will study the figures on the star-route service and the postal service during the last four or five years he will agree with me that it ought to be left out. The appropriation this year for the star-route service is greater than it ever was before.

Mr. LOUD. By a million and a half.

Mr. GRIGGS. Last year it was about, in round numbers, \$5,000,000, and this year it is about six millions and a half. I went back, I will say to my friend, as far as 1887 with these figures. I am sorry that I do not have them with me this morning, but I went back more than ten years, and this appropriation for the next fiscal year of six millions and a half is greater than it has ever been before in the history of the service by from a million to a million and a half dollars.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman not admit that the reason for that increase is that there is an increased cost of about 35 per cent by reason of the very restrictions thrown around the star-route service that he proposes to throw around the rural-delivery service, so that the increase to the star-route service is not because of the increased number of routes, but because of the increased cost by reason of the very thing that you propose to tack onto this bill?

Mr. GRIGGS. I can not admit that, because after most earnest questions from myself and from the chairman of the subcommittee on that particular line we were unable to get a definite reply from the Post-Office Department with reference to it.

Mr. HILL. I will state that I will give the gentleman the information so far as I have got it. I have heard it stated on the floor of this House in this debate that this star route had been increased about 35 per cent by reason of these restrictions, and my recollection is that I have received the same information from the Department.

Mr. BROMWELL. May I not ask the gentleman from Connecticut a question before he is seated?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. BROMWELL. Is that not a complete answer to the proposition of the gentleman from Indiana and others who have denounced this service as a cheap service?

Mr. HILL. Not at all.

Mr. BROMWELL. If the rural free-delivery service is placed under contract, and this star-route service shows that within the last two lettings, a year ago and this year, there has been an increase in the expense, does not that answer the criticism of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. HILL. Absolutely not. It simply shows that the professional contractors are getting a larger profit out of the business. That is all it shows.

Mr. GRIGGS. I would suggest to my friend from Connecticut that it has been impossible for us in our official investigations in this matter to obtain the information that the gentleman seems to have obtained somewhere.

But I want to say further in reply to the gentleman's question that the regulation of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General requiring the delivery of mail in boxes along the star route has increased in some degree the cost of this service, and that the regulation that the bidder shall live along the route has increased

in some degree the cost of the service; but it is not believed, as I understand, in the Department, and it is not my belief and not the belief of the committee, that it has increased the cost one million and a half dollars over the last fiscal year.

I merely stated that fact with reference to the star routes, not because I am a cheeseparer in these matters. So far as I am concerned, I believe the rural-delivery service ought to be extended as a matter of course. I do not believe that it is necessary for petitions to be filed, indorsed, referred and re-referred, and inspected and reinspected, and laid off and mapped out, and then, after a year or a year and a half of investigation, the route established.

I do not believe in that. I believe that when a petition or a desire or even an intimation comes from a community that it is desirous of rural service I believe it ought to have it. I do not believe the question ought to be asked now by the Department whether or not a particular route is self-sustaining.

That inquiry is not made with reference to the star routes or the establishment of post-offices, and if you should apply the same rule we would have no star routes, and if that rule were applied to fourth-class post-offices three-fourths of them would have to be abolished. I say if this rule were applied to the star routes and post-offices the people of the country away from the railroads would have no mail service. Gentlemen say we are attacking rural delivery, when the regulations of the Department make it impossible to put rural delivery in a large section of the United States. Yet, Mr. Chairman, the effort of the committee to cure this defect in the administration is denounced as an effort to destroy the service.

Now, I want to say another thing. Many gentlemen from my section of the country are very much afraid that there will be obnoxious carriers in case we adopt the contract service.

Why, Mr. Chairman, there can not be any more danger in the one case than in the other. That danger is ever present, and to avoid this in this service or in any other service, requires eternal vigilance on the part of the Representative. We have endeavored to surround it with such restrictions that no man obnoxious to a community can secure a contract. He must go to the Department before his bid will be considered with a clean sheet; he must go with the recommendation of a good moral character; he must go with a certificate and satisfactory evidence that he is a legal and actual resident of the district or territory in which the proposed service is to be performed.

He must show that he is an individual who is trustworthy, with a good moral character, able to read and write, and must have sufficient intelligence and ability to properly perform the service. Now, gentlemen say that under this proposed regulation they are afraid of that. Gentlemen know that I am as much opposed to this as they are, and I shall be very much opposed to anything that makes that more imminent than it is in the service already established.

So far as I am concerned, before I would agree to anything that in my opinion would render it likely throughout the South—before I would agree to do that, I would submit to any regulation of the Department; I would submit to any salary to carriers or any method of appointing them to prevent that.

And I will go further; I would stand with my people in favor of its destruction, if necessary, in order to prevent it. The administration of this Department is in the hands of department officials, and it is left to their good judgment and their discretion under this bill just as it is under any sort of regulations they may have established or can establish at any other time.

Now, my friend from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] found a mare's nest the other day. I have heard it said that lawyers differ as to the construction of laws, but laymen never. My friend from Connecticut is not a lawyer.

Mr. HILL. I hope not. [Laughter.]

Mr. GRIGGS. But, in the language of the boys down my way, he is a "jodarter" when it comes to construing law. He is afraid of this word "paragraph" in here, and I tried my best to get an opportunity to explain it the other day, but my friend from Virginia who had the floor declined to yield me time to do so. My friend from Connecticut charges that because of the presence of that word "paragraph" one man can secure and sublet all contracts for rural service in the entire country; yet the same section of the bill declares that not more than one contract shall be let to one person. We used the word "paragraph" simply because that was the only paragraph in the bill relating to the employment of carriers.

If it will get the support of my friend from Connecticut, I will consent to vote for an amendment to that effect. When you come to the "papa" business, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] is almost the papa of the contract system, because I believe he did first suggest it to us. He placed it on our front doorsteps and got away in the darkness and is now fighting his own child, calling it ours. [Laughter.] I say if the gentleman from Connecticut

insists that it will be better to change the word "paragraph" to "bill," I shall for one be willing to strike it out, if by so doing we can obtain his support.

Mr. LOUD. It can not be that he is the step-papa of this proposition. [Laughter.]

Mr. GRIGGS. I don't know. I judge from our talk about the matter that he was really its papa, but it might have been that the chairman of the committee and the gentleman from Connecticut were its joint progenitors. [Laughter.]

Mr. HILL. No; I disclaim any partnership of that kind.

Mr. GRIGGS. My friend thinks that the words "under such regulations as the Postmaster-General may prescribe, a substitute carrier may be employed," renders this service, if the bill should pass, open to the objection that one man can bid for every service in the United States and take it; and yet my friend, lawyer though he be—not, must admit that the Postmaster-General can not make regulations contrary to the law, contrary to the statute. This statute says that no person shall be awarded a contract for more than one route. Then how can one person get all the contracts?

My friend must admit that that was simply conjured up in his imagination, and that he was running from the signpost in the darkness, as the boy did whom we used to read about in the second reader, a long time ago. There need be no fear on that point. The bill itself provides specifically that no person can take more than one contract.

Now, gentlemen talk about a discrimination against the country and in favor of the city. I have not a city in my district. It is purely an agricultural district; and is made up almost exclusively of small tradesmen and farmers. If I were mean enough, I do not think anybody in this House would charge me with being fool enough to want to discriminate against my own constituents. It is a question at last as to whether the prophecy of the opponents of the bill shall come true, that it will decrease the efficiency of the service.

If it decreases the efficiency of the service it would be a discrimination. If it does not decrease it, but renders the Post-Office Department able to scatter it all over the country, then it would not be a discrimination against the country, but would assist in securing them what they ought to have—the full benefits of the service.

Gentlemen say that the star route is unpopular. My venerable friend from Connecticut [Mr. SPERRY] insists that the star route service has always been unpopular. I would like to know what anybody would offer instead of it. Unpopular when it is the only thing you can have? A man is popular or unpopular, comparatively, and an institution is popular or unpopular, comparatively speaking. The only man could not be unpopular. If there is nothing better, if there is nothing worse, if there is nothing but that, how can it be popular or unpopular? It is simply a service devised as the best means of carrying the mail to the people who live off the railroad.

I say to gentlemen who live on the railroad that the star-route service is all these people have, and they do not want to lose it. It is not all they can get, however. Rural delivery is a popular service. It was useless for me to say that, because everybody can see by the way in which members fall over one another in their desire to indorse it that it is an extremely popular service. There are sections where it can not go; there are sections where the star-route service must continue to supply the people. I believe if you adopt the contract service you can extend the rural-delivery service, because it ought to be as easy to put a rural-delivery route into operation as it is to make a star route.

Gentlemen say we want to make of this service a star-route service. It is not true. We do not desire to make of this service a star-route service. We want it to remain a rural-delivery service. We want it to carry the mail to the home of every man, but we want it to do so in the cheapest and most economical way, and we believe that the people will stand by us in our efforts.

My friend from Indiana inveighed grandiloquently against "cheapness;" and my friend from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], good business man that he is, hastened to say he could not agree with the gentleman on that proposition. What this committee desires to do is to give the people the best service possible at the very least expense, because in the end the people pay the expense.

Gentlemen talk with contempt about a salary of \$600. I do not know what the average income of the people is in the district of the gentleman from Connecticut or the gentleman from Indiana who talks so loftily about "cheapness" in connection with this service. But I do know that in the South the average annual income of men throughout the country is not \$600. Clerks, ministers, school teachers in Georgia work for salaries less than that.

A MEMBER. And in Connecticut, too.

Mr. GRIGGS. I believe that Georgia does as well as Connecticut, and that is why I did not say "Connecticut, too." School-teachers receive salaries of not more than \$40 a month in Georgia, and many much less, and are glad to get it. Some of them work

for six, some for eight, some for nine, and some for ten months in the year. Four hundred dollars a year is considered a pretty good salary for teachers throughout the country in Georgia.

Mr. THOMPSON. Are the teachers required to have a horse and buggy to carry them to and from the schoolhouse?

Mr. GRIGGS. No, sir; but if my friend will add \$200 to the \$400 he will admit that the teacher could supply himself every year with a new outfit.

Mr. NORTON. Oh, do not economize on the poor devils. [Laughter.]

Mr. GRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, that is the stock argument against this proposition. My friend from Ohio says, "Don't economize on these poor devils." I presume he means the rural carriers. But I say to my friend from Ohio that so far as the district from which I come considers matters of this sort, they believe it is my duty to economize on these "poor devils" in order that we may not extort money from those who pay the taxes.

When my friend interrupted me I was going on to say that the average salary in the average Congressional district of the United States is not \$600. Four hundred dollars would cover it; and I believe that is a high estimate. I believe that even in the Worcester district of Massachusetts \$400 would cover the average salary of the average man.

Mr. THAYER. Will the gentleman allow me a moment?

Mr. GRIGGS. With pleasure.

Mr. THAYER. I wish to inform the gentleman from Georgia that there is not a man who digs sewers in Worcester County who does not see more money than that in a year.

Mr. GRIGGS. I had no idea from what my friend said the other day there was such a thing as a sewer in the Worcester district—in "God's country." [Laughter.]

Mr. THAYER. The gentleman is not acquainted with that kind of a country.

Mr. GRIGGS. Thank God, I am not. What I have seen of it convinces me of the truth of the declaration of some gentleman in this Hall forty years ago—that its chief products are rocks and ice. I thank God we have not a country like that where I live.

But, seriously, I want to ask my friend from Massachusetts to answer me candidly whether there are not clergymen in his district who get less than \$600 a year salary?

Mr. THAYER. I do not think there is a man preaching in Massachusetts, either in my district or any other part of the State, that does not get, at the very lowest, one-third more than that sum.

Mr. GRIGGS. One-third more than \$600?

Mr. THAYER. Yes, sir.

Mr. GRIGGS. That is \$800. Now, does not the gentleman believe that a clergyman is worth as much as a rural mail carrier?

Mr. THAYER. I think he would be worth more down in Georgia. [Laughter.]

Mr. GRIGGS. What about Massachusetts? The gentleman is correct in his facetious reply. A clergyman is worth more than a rural carrier in Georgia; and will the gentleman deny that he is worth more than a carrier in Massachusetts? I wait for the gentleman to answer.

Mr. THAYER. I think that a gentleman of the clerical profession is far above the politicians who the gentleman is afraid are going to transfer political control down in Georgia from the Democracy to the Republicans because the Republicans appoint them. But I want to say to the gentleman from Georgia that there is scarcely a laboring man in Massachusetts engaged in any vocation who does not receive at least \$1.75 a day; and I want to say further that in my district, where four of these routes have been established, there is one of them on which it has been absolutely impossible for a year and a half to find a single person to take the job at \$500. The office is not filled; the Government is waiting for a carrier.

Mr. GRIGGS. And yet the gentleman from Massachusetts says that when he sees the vehicle of the star-route contractor who performs service from Worcester to some little town in his district, his face mantles with the blush of shame because of the poor character of the outfit.

Mr. THAYER. I want to say distinctly that we were ashamed that the United States Government would use the poorest equipment that was to be found in our section of country to carry the mails—a vehicle with the tire wired—

Mr. GRIGGS. I hope the gentleman will not take up all my time.

Mr. THAYER. I thought the gentleman was willing that I should ask him a question.

Mr. GRIGGS. I am perfectly willing to allow the gentleman to ask a question. The gentleman says that he blushed with shame over that. Now, where did that man come from who took that contract? He must have come from Massachusetts. He must be from the Worcester district; yet he took a contract that does not enable him to carry the mail with a decent equipage.

Yet the gentleman says that every laborer in that district gets from a dollar and a half to a dollar and seventy-five cents a day. One statement answers the other. I can not understand it otherwise.

Mr. THAYER. If the gentleman will allow me, I can not speak with authority, but I think this man is one of those miserable creatures who take a subcontract from a contractor who is located here in Washington, and he was unable to carry out his contract. His team was so poor and attracted such attention that the newspapers took it up and commented upon it. I do not know where the man came from. He may have come from Georgia for aught I know. [Laughter.]

Mr. GRIGGS. That was a Massachusetts team and a Massachusetts man. He undertook this business in the district of the gentleman from Worcester.

My friend from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] assumes a very lofty attitude, as does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. THAYER], with reference to salaries. I stated upon this floor during the absence of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and it has not been denied by anyone except himself, that the average salary of the average person in every Congressional district in the United States is not more than \$600 a year. The gentleman from Massachusetts denies it so far as his district is concerned, and I must accept his denial.

Mr. THAYER. Just a word. I have never denied that the average salary of an average man was not more than \$600. But you must remember that this mail carrier does not get the \$600 for himself. He must employ two horses and a vehicle and care for them, and I say the average compensation for a man and two horses in my district or in any district in Massachusetts for a year is over \$600.

Mr. GRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, two horses are not a necessity in this service. Men have been performing this service in Georgia—as poor a country as my friend would have us believe he thinks it is—for several years with one horse, and they can continue to do so. Horses wear out and men wear out. It might be better for the people from the Worcester district of Massachusetts, for fear that their present distinguished Representative would wear out, to send two Representatives here.

Mr. LANDIS. I will say in that connection that I received a letter a few days ago from a carrier in my district who stated that during the recent winter he had been compelled to have three horses in order to carry his route.

Mr. FLEMING. But two of them were sick.

Mr. LANDIS. And I will say to the gentleman in that connection—

Mr. GRIGGS. I hope my friend will be as brief as possible.

Mr. LANDIS. I will ask that the gentleman's time be extended. I would ask the gentleman, if the Post-Office Department allows \$240 a year for the postman in a city who uses a horse and cart for that service, if that is not evidence of the fact that a horse and cart practically stand the carrier \$240 a year, and if an allowance of \$240 a year is essential for one horse and cart, would not \$340 or \$350 be a fair allowance for two horses and a cart for a rural free-delivery carrier.

Mr. GRIGGS. I will answer my friend in the fewest words possible, because I have not the time to say all I would like to say. Two hundred and forty dollars a year is a very high allowance for a horse and a wagon.

Mr. LANDIS. It is a liberal allowance.

Mr. GRIGGS. A wagon made in the gentleman's own State, with a cover, provided for this service, is being used in my district, in my own county, and my information is that it cost \$60. I believe he has two horses, and they did not cost him over \$150. There is \$150 for the cost of his horses and \$60 for the cost of his vehicle, or a total cost of \$210.

Mr. CURTIS. What about the harness?

Mr. GRIGGS. I will add \$20 for that, making \$230.

Mr. CURTIS. What about the feed?

Mr. GRIGGS. I will come to that. Now, that is allowing \$230 for the cost of the horses and the wagon. The life of that team and of that wagon is at least ten years, and 10 per cent a year of the cost would cover the expense of replacing the horses and wagon. Twenty-five dollars a year would cover that cost. The cost of feed for a horse in the country is a very small item, indeed.

Mr. LANDIS. Well, how much?

Mr. GRIGGS. In Georgia—and I presume the same thing is true in Indiana—in Georgia a man can ordinarily feed a horse and take care of him in the country for four or five dollars a month.

Mr. LANDIS. He can not do it in Indiana.

Mr. GRIGGS. He can ordinarily buy corn at from 40 to 65 cents a bushel the year round. He can buy corn in the harvest season at from 40 to 50 cents everywhere throughout the State.

Mr. HILL. What do you make the annual cost of equipment and maintenance in Georgia?

Mr. GRIGGS. I make the annual cost of equipment and maintenance, say, \$150, and that is exceedingly liberal. Now, so far as I am concerned I will say to my friend that I do not think \$600 would be an adequate salary without an allowance, and I do not believe the salary will remain at that figure. I believe \$600 will be an adequate salary if you add to that an allowance, \$100 or \$150, for maintenance.

Mr. HILL. Now, if the gentleman will allow me—

Mr. GRIGGS. I fear I have not time.

Mr. HILL. I will ask that the gentleman's time be extended.

Mr. LOUD. One moment, about the extension of time. There can not be any extension of time, because the time is all used up.

Mr. HILL. We will get some time from our side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GRIGGS] has expired.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes more.

Mr. GRIGGS. Make it ten.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have ten minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the time of the gentleman be extended ten minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, I want to state that there is an hour and twenty minutes promised on my side of the question, and there is not that amount of time remaining. If the other side desire to yield, why, they can do so.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Chair understand the gentleman from California to object?

Mr. LOUD. I shall have to object.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I think with the consent of the committee, that the other side will give the gentleman from Georgia five minutes.

Mr. GRIGGS. I can not accept that.

Mr. HILL. I ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] if he will not allow the gentleman five minutes' time?

Mr. SWANSON. I will yield five minutes' time to the gentleman.

Mr. GRIGGS. Will you make it ten?

Mr. SWANSON. I will give the gentleman ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia yields ten minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. HILL. Now, I should like to ask the gentleman from Georgia, in view of his statement that the allowance of 10 per cent for deterioration of equipment, cost of maintenance, interest on capital, etc., together with horse feed, can be maintained in Georgia for \$150 a year, how it is that as a member of the Post-Office Committee he has voted for an appropriation this year of \$650,000, to provide the following compensation in Georgia:

In Americus, \$200 a year; in Atlanta, Ga., \$221 a year; in Augusta, Ga., \$200 a year; Columbus, Ga., \$225; Macon, Ga., \$200—

Mr. GRIGGS. Now, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. HILL. This is my time. Rome, Ga., \$200; Savannah, Ga., \$200. This is on an average of 33½ per cent higher, and he, as a member of the committee, has already voted and sent in a bill covering that appropriation. I would like him to explain the discrepancy between his present statement and his vote.

Mr. GRIGGS. My friend well understands that this is based on the estimates of the Post-Office Department. The gentleman knows that I am only one member of the Committee on the Post-Office, and that I do not belong even to the majority of the committee, and have very little influence with the Post-Office Department.

Mr. HILL. These figures are not the basis; these are the actual amounts paid this year.

Mr. GRIGGS. I know that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. They found they could get that much and just got it.

Mr. GRIGGS. I will say to my friend that I base my statement on the cost of keeping a horse in the country and not in a city. I never lived in a city and do not know what it costs to keep a horse in a city.

Now then, I want to say in behalf of this committee that it is their desire to equalize these routes so that adequate compensation can be paid in every district throughout the country for this service and no more. That is the sole idea of the committee. We do not intend to cripple the service; we would not cripple it if we could, and we could not cripple it if we would.

Our idea is, if this bill can be passed, that it will so equalize the service that rural delivery can be extended everywhere, and we do not believe it can or will be extended everywhere under the present system.

Gentlemen talk about the mileage basis of pay. You can not establish that, because, I have no doubt, in the hills of my friend's [Mr. HILL] district it costs more than in the plains in the district of my friend from Indiana to carry this service.

There are such inequalities in it, as I have said, that almost

every district is different from every other district in the service, and that is the occasion of this bill. The committee hopes that through the contract service rural delivery can be extended to its utmost limit. That is all the Post-Office Committee is attempting to do. We do not propose to pay a carrier, because he happens to be in the Government service, a higher salary than the average income of the man to whom he carries the mail every day. It is not justice to the farmers along the route.

Now, the gentlemen from Indiana and from Massachusetts intimated a few moments ago that we are afraid of these rural carriers. I have not uttered a word that authorizes that conclusion. I am, I confess, not impervious to influences in my district. I confess that. I confess that I have not yet reached that high position where I am blind to what my friends and constituents at home may request me to do.

I confess that I am not deaf to the appeals of my constituency yet, though, unlike the gentleman from Indiana, I hope I am not ready to rush to the extreme limit of what anybody might demand in order to keep from being coerced. The gentleman from Indiana said that the chairman of this committee and this committee were afraid that Congress would be coerced; and then, in order to make himself safe from coercion, he went to the very highest limit that anybody ever thought of as a salary for any letter carrier in the country—\$1,100.

Of course the gentleman from Indiana can not be coerced. There was once a Hebrew in my town named Jacoby. Old man Sam Mack got full one day, and he went into Jacoby's store and decided that Jacoby's head was the dancing end of his anatomy. So he took Jacoby by the feet and danced him around on his head.

Eventually Jacoby escaped, and, rushing up the street, met the chief of police and exclaimed: "Mr. Chief, come down to my store, and come right now." The chief asked: "What is the matter?" He said: "Sam Mack is down at my store; he is down there drunk, and he made me so mad I had to run out of my own place of business." [Laughter.] The gentleman from Indiana is so determined not to be coerced that he at once rushes to the extreme limit of demands that anybody can make in this service and agrees to a salary of \$1,100.

Now, the members of this committee, I believe, are as honest and as able and as capable and know as much about the mail service of the country as any other 17 gentlemen that can be congregated together in this House or from anywhere else. I believe that the chairman of the committee knows more about the post-office service than any other 10 men combined in the United States, whether in the service or out of it, whether in this House or out of it.

So far as I am concerned, I say that freely. But the gentleman from Indiana knows, and every member of the House knows, that the gentleman from California owns no member of the committee. He would not control it if he could, and he could not control it if he would. We have presented to you what we believe to be the most feasible plan, the very best plan for extending this service to all the people. We want the blessings of rural delivery to go to every home in the United States. We do not believe, under the present plan of administration—under the present system—that it can be extended to all the homes of all the people because of its great cost.

Now, as far as I am concerned, I shall never stop to consider that again. This vote, in my opinion, will end all controversy as to the system. As far as I am concerned, if this House votes down this proposition, my position henceforth will be to give the people the service. I shall say, let them have it; extend it throughout all the country; put it in the mountains of the West, establish it in the plains of the South and West, put it throughout the mountains of New England, let all the people have it, without stopping to count what it may cost. [Applause.]

I am not going to offer any proposition, so far as I am concerned, and I am not going to support any proposition as far as this service is concerned, except that which I believe is best for the service and best for all the people. I am willing to give it to the people throughout the whole country, and I shall not stop to consider, as far as I am concerned, the few dollars it may cost to give it to them. [Applause.]

Mr. LOUD. I now yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE].

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I ask the attention of the committee while I briefly review the growth of this service, giving my objections to the carrier system and my reasons for supporting the contract system. In 1895, I believe it was, there was inserted in the regular appropriation bill authorization to use for experimental rural free-delivery service \$20,000. It does not appear that this was all used, however, and \$10,000 of it was reappropriated in 1897.

In 1898 \$50,000 was appropriated in the regular Post-Office appropriation bill for that purpose. In 1899, in the regular appropriation bill, there was appropriated \$150,000. In 1900 there was appropriated \$300,000, and that year there was a deficiency of

\$150,000 appropriated by the Appropriations Committee in the urgent deficiency bill. In 1901 there was appropriated \$1,750,000. In 1902 there was appropriated \$3,500,000 and a deficiency of \$491,000. There is recommended for the next year \$7,529,000.

So that you see how steadily this appropriation for experimental service has increased, and how in the last few years it has bounded from thousands to millions. I want to speak for a district that made in the last decade a greater increase in population and more in manufactures and other industrial pursuits than perhaps any district in the South, and yet it is without a single rural free-delivery route. Notwithstanding this, it is argued by some that this service has been fairly distributed over the country.

What I shall say will be not against this system, but in favor of it. The friends of this bill are the real friends of the rural free delivery. I believe that if you adopt the carrier system with the increased salaries that will follow you will make it impossible for communities like those of my district to ever have this system extended to it. If you want to make it of universal application, you should begin on a practical, economical plan that will make it possible. I want to show you some of the representations upon which the Bureau that has this service in charge has secured at least some of the appropriations I have mentioned. When the chief came before the Committee on Appropriations to obtain the first deficiency of \$150,000 in 1900, he was examined, and I have here his hearing, but in view of the limited time I have I will only refer to such parts of it as appear to me to be pertinent to the point I desire to make.

In answer to the question what it would cost, he said: "I can show you places where people have offered to do the work for \$200 a year. When we first started the service we had different people bid on it, and we had bids as low as \$120."

In closing, upon the question of salaries, because it was pertinent for the committee to know from an officer who had created a deficiency of \$150,000 in an experimental service what he could have it done for and why he wanted an increase, he answered: "If they will stand pat on the salary I will guarantee to find all the men in the country to work the free rural-delivery service for \$400 a year."

Mr. BOUTELL. Who was that?

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Machen, the chief of the Bureau. Now, without any legislation fixing the salaries he pays the carriers \$600, and if you go on and continue this service under the civil-service law the salaries will soon be \$1,000. And if the salaries are increased to \$1,000 a year, is there a member of Congress who will stand in his place and tell me that there can be a universal extension of the service throughout the country? No. The majority have proposed to reduce the revenues of your Government \$70,000,000, and they had my cordial cooperation in that effort. But while that measure has the approval of the country, it must fail unless we reduce expenses somewhere.

Let me call attention to the pertinent fact that with the income from the war-tax law, the estimated revenue for next year aggregates only \$712,000,000, while the estimates for appropriations amount to \$742,000,000, a deficit of \$30,000,000. I concede that \$54,000,000 have been estimated for the sinking fund, which may or may not be used, but gentlemen will see how close we are to the danger line when we undertake to reduce our revenues \$70,000,000 in the present condition of the Treasury, and at the same time increase expenses.

As a Democrat in favor of rigid economy, I appeal to all who claim to be Democrats to support every proposition to reduce expenditures and taxes, and at the same time I warn the majority of this House of the danger from a fiscal standpoint which they are to incur in voting down this bill. What does it mean? Defeat this bill and extend this service where it is needed with a carrier under the civil-service law and you must increase taxes, issue bonds, or increase the rates of postage. One of these results must follow as certainly as night follows day.

You can not escape it. Is there a man here who will rise in his place and say he is willing to increase postage on letters from 2 cents to 3 cents, or that he will vote to increase taxes in order to defray the expenses of this service, or that he would consent to the Government issuing bonds, as may be done under the bill passed by the last Congress? If you are not ready to do one of these three things, be careful what plan you adopt for the extension of this service. If by hasty, extravagant legislation you make either necessary, then prepare for the wrath of the people whom you must confront in November. Under the contract system the service can be extended wherever needed at only a small increase over the star-route service.

The prosperous times that now surround us will not continue always, and I tell the gentlemen who say they do not care what it costs that a proposition to increase the number of officeholders 50,000 or 60,000 is one of the most momentous and dangerous propositions, in my judgment, that has been presented in this Congress or in any other in recent years.

Think of it. By voting down this bill you declare that you will not have contractors with fixed terms of service, and that you want officeholders, and for life. From the standpoint of economy and good administration my argument against such a scheme ought to commend itself to Republicans. But I ask all Democrats to advert to the platform declaration of your party in 1896 against a life tenure. I will read it, and I hope it will burn itself into the convictions of all who profess the Democratic faith:

We are opposed to life tenure in public service, except as provided by the Constitution. We favor appointments based on merit, fixed terms of office, and such an administration of the civil-service laws as will afford equal opportunity to all citizens of ascertained fitness.

As against a system that invites bids from every citizen along each route, it is proposed to put from 40,000 to 60,000 persons upon the salary roll, to be taken care of from the time they enter the service until they die; because I know, as every member of the Appropriations Committee knows, that it is utterly impossible ever to get rid of any bureau when once established permanently.

We can not even weed out the inefficient clerks in the best-regulated bureaus of the Government. Fasten these men upon your pay roll and they will stay there, to be supported by taxes as long as they live, unless the system you adopt has the effect to weight down the service so that it must be stopped; and if that is done, those who have not the service will never get it, and those who have received it to some extent will get no more. Will anyone argue that it would be right to give it to one section and refuse it to another, as has been done?

I want to answer briefly some of the objections made to the carrier system. I could not help but be amused at the suggestion of the gentleman from Virginia that the contract carrier will be less polite than the officeholder. Why, sir, when did the gentleman learn that by giving a man an office for life you make him polite? Candidates are often polite while they are seeking the office; but the gruffest and most insulting people we meet anywhere are those who feel themselves intrenched by the civil-service law—protected for life against removal and indifferent to those who do not hold office. It does not affect all persons in this way; but it is a mistake to assume that life tenure conduces to politeness.

It is argued that these contractors will be the agents of the people, not of the Government. Why, Mr. Chairman, can we not make the contractors the agents of the people and the Government and make them responsible? I remember that in my little service here we once had a Sergeant-at-Arms who was supposed to be only the agent of the members. He stole \$85,000 of our money, including \$365 of mine, of which I have never gotten a dollar. Congress at once, by law, made the Sergeant-at-Arms a disbursing officer of the Government and placed him under bond. And now the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House is the agent of the Government, not our agent. We can as easily make the contractor the agent of the Government as we can carriers. So there is nothing in that argument.

You can do by regulation for the contractor just what you can do for the officeholder. But it is objected that these contractors would be "cheap" men. Mr. Chairman, if we get competent men, that is just what we want.

We will then get three contracts where we now get two, and I will undertake to say that if you will pass this bill, I will get all the men needed in Arkansas on all routes not exceeding 20 miles in length for \$300, if you will permit them to do express work.

In my country, in the industrial pursuits, labor is paid as high a price perhaps as in any district in the United States, ranging from \$1.50 to \$5 a day in the mills. That is the usual salary of the operators in the mills; but the farm hands can not command exceeding \$15 and \$20 a month, and never exceeding \$25, and then they do not work twelve months in the year either. Clerks can not command salaries exceeding \$50; expert bookkeepers can not get over \$75 a month. Ministers and school-teachers preach and teach all over my country for from \$300 to \$500 a year, in the rural districts, and in the towns rarely ever get \$1,000; and yet you want to put upon the country 50,000 mail carriers in uniform drawing \$1,000 a year.

You can get young men—competent young men—to do the work for \$300 and \$400. Yea, Mr. Chairman, you will find on every mail route in my State, and I believe in every other State in the United States, some man who has but one leg or but one arm, or some physical defect that disables him from active manual labor, who would be glad to get these routes of 20 miles for \$300 a year. I know one of the best mail carriers that I ever saw, who takes the mail out of my own town, 18 miles and back again, and does it for \$340 a year.

He is a courteous, competent man, able and willing to do such work; but as he only has one arm he can not do farm labor. Why should such men not have a chance to earn a living? Why should not this service have this labor? The service has been

extended in the most thickly settled parts of the country, where the roads are good, where the people are convenient to post-offices, and refused in sparsely settled communities where the people are miles from any office. In my country, where they can not get a post-office within 5 miles of them, and where the roads are bad, the Department does not give us any kind of service. It is often impossible to get an office established, and if we do we only get special service. Under the contract system, if you will permit these people to do express business and carry telegrams and packages, they will supplement their pay, and by the competition in bidding the Government will get the benefit of this and the contractors will still get living salaries in every community, and give the people the service in that respect so much needed and wanted.

Now, under your carrier system this is not likely to be done. Under our contract system it will be done. So, Mr. Chairman, I appeal to this committee in behalf of a section of country that is in need of better mail facilities to go slow upon a system that will by reason of its expense prevent improvement where most needed.

I believe the mail is the greatest educator that we have for grown up people, and I have repeatedly, from the first Congress I entered until the last, advocated the increase of the appropriation for star-route service in order that more people might have the benefit of mails; but I have been defeated in every proposition I have made, and now, lastly, I appeal to you not to so hedge about this system with officeholders and so discriminate against the private citizen that it will make it impossible for people in our country to ever get the benefit of it. [Applause.]

[Mr. DAVIDSON addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SWANSON. I yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KERN].

Mr. KERN. Mr. Chairman, I do not rise for the purpose of questioning the integrity of the intentions, or the ability of the eminent gentlemen who compose this committee. On the contrary, I believe that the men who compose this committee are absolutely honest, thoroughly able, and highly honorable. I shall not attempt to discuss this question from any standpoint of personality, but I shall rather attempt to go into the principle of the matter.

I am opposed to this bill because I am an unfaltering and uncompromising supporter of the free rural mail delivery system. I am opposed to it because, in my opinion, if it is enacted into a law it will seriously impair the usefulness of that system. I am opposed to it because, in my belief, it will bring the system now so much admired by the people into contempt with the people. I believe that the passage of this bill will in its effect amount to the planting of a powder magazine under the system which will, in its final operation, lead to its sure destruction.

This bill proposes to inaugurate the radical change of substituting the contract system in the employment of the carriers on the free rural mail-delivery routes which have been established in this country and which are hereafter to be established for the system of employing the carriers by appointment under the merit system and paying them a fixed salary for their labor. This proposed departure looks to me like retrogression. It looks to me like taking a step backward in the administration of the affairs of this Government. The watchword of this and every other Congress that meets here should be progress instead of the reverse. Every step we take here should be a cautious but sure step in advance instead of to the rear.

The contract system has been tried in every department of our vast and intricate Government machinery from the school districts and the township up to the performance of the most important functions of the National Government. The objections to it have been revealed by a long line of experience. They seem to inhere in the system itself. They can only be cured by the abandonment of the system. One need not go far in his investigations to discover the fact that the higher and more progressive thought of the country unqualifiedly condemns it.

It is true that it does at times result in cheaper service for the Government, if cheapness be the end sought. It seems to me that in this instance the end in view should be a decidedly different one. We should not merely ask ourselves the question, in determining how to cast our votes on this bill, how can we obtain the cheapest possible service, but it is the part of wisdom to inquire, in this important connection, how can we obtain the best possible service for the people whom we are seeking to benefit, and how can we best promote the happiness of the people and sow the seeds of good will and the most cordial relations among them instead of the seeds of hatred and discord?

The ends last named will certainly not be attained by the adoption of the contract system in the rural free mail delivery department of this Government. There never was a greater breeder of discord and dissension among the people than this very contract

system which we have heard so eloquently eulogized by the other side on this floor during the last few days. It has always been a veritable apple of discord. Why, the accursed thing has again and again set father against son; son against father; sister against brother and brother against sister; brother against brother and friend against friend; neighbor against neighbor and citizen against citizen. It has caused quarrels enough to disturb the peace of the world. It has stamped more bitter frowns on human faces and made more men unforgiving and implacable enemies than all other causes—and I except none—on earth combined.

The objection is seriously urged by well-meaning men on this floor that the appointive system, if continued in this Department, will lead to abuse and to the improper and corrupt use of political power. I have no shadow of a doubt in my mind that there will be some abuses committed under the appointive system, and that there will be attempts made by peanut politicians to prostitute the free rural mail-delivery system for selfish and partisan purposes. The complete elimination of the possibility of these things, which are universally condemned by all good men—and these are happily greatly in the majority in this country—would perhaps necessitate a radical change in human nature as it is now constituted.

The only remedy I know for the cure of this evil is to enlighten public sentiment. Arouse the community against the contemptible scoundrels who undertake to debauch the most sacred and useful institutions of the people for great or trifling private gain and it will be sure to meet with the rebuke and punishment which it so richly deserves. Hold them up to the scorn and the contempt which their unmanly and unpatriotic conduct merits. An extended free rural mail-delivery service will help very materially to facilitate all just efforts to reach and inform the people to arouse their righteous indignation and their justifiable scorn against methods of that kind.

They can be taught without much difficulty, to repel the selfish advances of the interested fixer and to despise his shrewdest and most cunningly contrived manipulations. I for one do not permit the anticipations of danger from this source to frighten me into casting a vote against a principle which my better judgment tells me is unsound and against a policy which I consider not only unwise but totally vicious and most certainly destructive of a system which, I take it, we are charged with building up and not undermining and tearing down.

But when it is intimated that under the blessed boughs of the contract system the atmosphere is pure and uncontaminated and that that system enjoys immunity from manipulation, abuse, corruption, and fraud, the estimable gentlemen who convey the intimation seem to me to be indulging in biting sarcasm and keenest satire, while the knowing smile significantly and perhaps keep their peace and say nothing. There has been more fraud perpetrated, more unfairness indulged in, and more crime committed, and more guilty men have escaped just and deserved punishment and have successfully dodged the penitentiary in performing the work of awarding government contracts than in any other field of chicanery, rascality, and criminal endeavor.

It is not because the criminals connected with this work of awarding Government contract have been more numerous than in other fields of human effort, but because the temptation has been infinitely greater and the probabilities of detection and arrest decidedly smaller. On this point I defy successful contradiction. Carefully sealed envelopes are stealthily opened by many a man charged with the solemn duty of awarding the contracts, and the bids of his competitors are shown and their contents disclosed to the favorite with the pull without the slightest compunction of conscience whatever.

Rake offs are cheerfully accepted and stipulated for in the coldest and most business-like manner. Good bids are rejected for inadequate reason in the interests of the most flagrant kind of partiality and favoritism. Corrupt combinations are formed to avoid the disastrous results of reckless and ruinous underbidding. The crime of bribery dates from the invention of the contract system. The contract system gave it its birth in the most natural way. It is the legitimate mother of crimes unnumbered and innumerable. It is the bane which lies at the root of the evils of all of our great cities to-day, and which has poisoned and now poisons municipal politics throughout the length and breadth of this great country.

The contract system has never won or increased the respect of any man for his Government. The winner in the contest as well as the loser was compelled to engage in a distasteful and disgusting cutthroat business to attain his victory, which is, as a rule, if it is honestly won under the ruinous competition of this day and age, not worth the having; and perhaps he would be better off if he had lost it, too, and the triumph had gone to some other unfortunate victim. I know of many cases where the winner came out loser and of some where prosperous business men have become hopeless bankrupts and pitiable objects of public charity,

and of some where they wound up the miserable transaction in suicides' graves.

I take it, Mr. Chairman, that the free rural mail-delivery system, which in this country is still in its infancy and which is so promising of bright results for the future, is too splendid an institution to have its chances for survival imperiled at this stage of its development by injecting into its make-up the deadly virus of the accursed contract system. If the contract system is to be granted a renewal of life, why commence to reanimate it in connection with this new and in every way vigorous branch of the Postal Department of our Government?

I fail to see the reason why the rural carrierships should be let to the lowest bidder while postmasters and other employees of the Government, whose work is no more important, and in many cases not nearly so important as the work of the rural carriers of the mails, should be paid a fixed salary. If the principle on which the proposed departure is to rest be sound, and I deny its soundness, and the intended policy wise, and I deny its wisdom, then I fail to see why all of the jobs which the Government has to give should not be let to the lowest bidder and the much-praised auctioneering principle and policy given universal application. If it would result in economy, fairness, and an improved public service in the case of the free rural mail carriers, then is it not reasonable to expect the same effects to follow the same causes in connection with other governmental positions? It is contended that some routes are more easily and can therefore be more cheaply carried than others. This contention is correct. But so can some jobs be more easily and therefore more cheaply performed in the Treasury, Pension, and other departments of the Government. Yet in these departments employees in the same grade receive a uniform wage, although they do not by any means render equal service.

The rural mail carrier is a workingman. He is required to work hard for his living for small pay. He is compelled to brave all sorts of inclement weather. Rain, snow, or storm, scorching summer heat or the bitterest cold of winter is not accepted as an excuse for his staying at home. The laborer is worthy of his hire. Every workingman in this country is entitled to living wages and a little more. While I am a believer in strict governmental economy, I do not believe that this Government should set the example to the country of paying starvation wages to workingmen. It should rather set the example of paying liberal wages to the men and women who perform the actual work, hold no sinecures, and do the hard knocking in the service of the Government.

We do not hesitate to pay a conquering hero in the Philippine Islands a salary of \$20,000 per year, outside of the perquisites which attach to this position of glorious expansion and benevolent assimilation, but we engage in all sorts of cheeseparing and debate on this floor for many days on the question of whether a rural mail carrier shall receive \$500 or only \$250 per annum for the hard and useful toil which he performs. I believe in spending less money for conquest and more for the dissemination of intelligence.

I believe in spending less money for the manufacture and use of the murderous implements of bloody warfare and more for education. I believe that when the free rural mail system was established in this country a great and mighty torch was planted on this hemisphere, which will shed its rays of calcium light to the remotest and darkest corners of it. It will bring blessings to the people, where all the wars bring curses in their train.

The farmers of this country are entitled to the best mail service which this Government can give them. The farm is the cradle not only of the statesmanship of the future in America as it has been in the past, but of the leading business talent and the dominant professional talent which will have in its hands and under its guidance the business and professional affairs of the country as well. Our statesmen are not reared in luxurious palaces and antique castles. Their names are not adorned with high-sounding titles. They come from the lonely farmhouses uncontaminated with vice and unaffected by the enervating influences of wealth and luxury. Our great characters come not from the top heap of human society, but they rise from the bottom up.

Every farmer is a business man in every sense which that term implies. He is certainly as much entitled to have his letters brought to the door of his humble home as is the man who resides within a more pretentious edifice inside the limits of a city.

He, like his fellow-men who are more fortunately located, is also interested in the daily doings of the world in which he lives. He is therefore entitled to receive his newspapers which contain the record of the history of the world as it is made regularly and in seasonable time. The free rural mail-delivery system is simply a sensible supplement made to our great educational system, and it should be cherished, fostered, and preserved.

I desire to say in addition that the wage system has become a fixity in our Government. Experience has proved the expedience

and efficiency of that system. The demand among the people is not for an abridgement of this wage system, but for the extension of it. The workmen of this country, among which I include the farmers, are this day demanding that the navy-yards be placed on the same practical and altogether satisfactory basis that the Government Printing Office stands on, and on which it is being so successfully conducted. I place the contract system in the same category with the antiquated fee system still prevailing in many of our courts.

Both are totally vicious and are ruthlessly condemned by the dearly bought experience of many years. I place it in the same category with the abominable and fossilized piecework system which prevails in the mail-bag repair shop conducted by this Government in this enlightened city. This shop is a proper subject for the investigation of the humane society. In that shop women with children to support are compelled to eke out a living on incomes which some days do not exceed the munificent sum of 40 or 50 cents.

This shop is a disgrace to this country. Its very existence is an outrage and an atrocious black splotch on the otherwise fair escutcheon of this great Government. It is one of the very worst sweat shops within our borders. The system in vogue there, in the interests of preserving our good name, should be speedily abolished, and the wage system should be substituted for it, and the people who are compelled by force of unfortunate circumstances to eke out a living amid those unpleasant surroundings should be paid fair and living wages for their hard and unremitting toil. I mention this fact only to show to you the evils of systems other than the one which this bill threatens to destroy in connection with an important department of the Government.

Let the farmers of this country have the free mail-delivery service untrammelled, unencumbered, and unimpaired. So perfect the system that in the fullness of time every farmer under our flag can have his mail delivered to his home every day. Bring his mail to him as well as you take it to the bank and the counting house and the exchange, and give him a chance to get his own communications to the men he does business with into the mails. Bring his newspapers to him regularly and promptly and you will greatly raise the standard of intelligence in this country.

On the universal education of the people and on the average degree of intelligence that prevails among them depend the safety and the purity of our free institutions. It was the great Jefferson who wrote that he would rather live in a country with newspapers and without a government than to live in a country with a government without newspapers were he compelled to take his choice between the two.

His great mind grasped the vital principle that an enlightened people can be trusted to be orderly and to exercise a broad and general justice in the end. He well knew that in the presence of ignorance, selfishness, and cupidity, with these the predominating factors in life, no sort of government could be beneficent or could long endure. Let the light shine. Light the torches of intelligence all along the line. Disseminate knowledge; plant facts; spread education. Do nothing that will have a tendency to tear down the great aid to education and enlightenment which this newly born rural mail-carrier system is.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. KERN. Only one more minute, Mr. Chairman, and I am done.

Mr. SWANSON. I yield two minutes more to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KERN. Be not stingy with the carriers. Do not let the charge of cheapness hold good against you in this connection. Pay them good and fixed wages and then require of them that they perform their work honestly, efficiently and impartially, and without partisan prejudice or bias. Make of it a system to which this country can point with just pride as it is now doing and has just reason to do to its efficient and nonpartisan railway mail-clerk system and its magnificent printing office.

Place all in the same grade and class, on the same footing, with the same requirements, and on the same pay, and let that pay be adequate and reasonable. This Government can not afford to be niggardly with its honest, useful, and faithful toilers, and subject them to the manipulations of the cold-blooded auctioneer. I shall cast my vote against this bill, because I honestly believe that if it becomes a law it will destroy the free rural mail-carrier system. [Loud applause.]

Mr. SWANSON. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALBERT].

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman who has just taken his seat has so eloquently said, the establishment of the system of free rural delivery is intended primarily and to be maintained afterwards in the interests of the great farming class of this country in common with all others living in the country, that class and that industry which is the foundation stone of all happiness, of all greatness, and of all prosperity; and from the time that I

first entered this House in the Fifty-third Congress I have been an ardent supporter of this free rural-delivery system in the interests of that large class of people who are only recognized, so to speak, by this Government, by the auditor, and the tax collector once a year and sometimes oftener.

It is singular and strange to me that whenever a system is evolved and put into operation here which tends to elevate and to upbuild that class, to make country life more desirable, to diffuse general knowledge and intelligence throughout the country amongst the great mass of the people—people who are isolated naturally—that there should always appear on this floor so many eloquent advocates against that system, who all want to say at once that this will cost too much, because, forsooth, it applies to that class. You never hear anything about economy when the managers of great corporations, the great controllers of trusts, and the great monopolists come here and want anything. They have advocate upon top of advocate; but, strange to say, when something is proposed for the great mass of the people—the farmers of this country—who produce that which feeds and clothes the world, and who after feeding and clothing themselves and every other citizen, and every other class and profession, send enough abroad to pay the balance of trade of this nation in its business with other nations, you find so many crying out it will cost too much. Why begin to economize on the farmers?

About the very first speech, or among the first speeches, that I made was made in the Fifty-third Congress in the interest of an appropriation of \$20,000, which was introduced by Mr. Moses, then a member of the Post-Office Appropriation Committee, as an amendment to that bill. I advocated it in a speech, Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi and several others advocated it, and it passed, and that was the first practical appropriation that the Postmaster-General ever made use of which started this great system. This sum was then increased from session to session and from Congress to Congress till it reached its present proportions. I have heard men get up on this floor here, who had hardly thought of Congress then, and claim to be the great organizers and starters of this system. It is not strange that so many should now want to daddify the project. I heard of it before I ever came to Congress, and have only done what I could to push it along, because I saw it was good.

Now, the first argument against this system is that it will cost too much. If the people in the country are entitled to a service at all, they are entitled to an efficient service. Look over the bill that is to come up for consideration soon, from the Post-Office Appropriation Committee. You find there the enormous sum of \$17,000,000 or \$18,000,000 appropriated for free delivery in the cities and large towns all over this country of ours. I am not here to militate against or oppose that appropriation. I say let them have it, because it is right. In addition, they have appropriations for street-car tickets, bicycles, and every other facility in addition to the large salaries that these city carriers get. But I ask in the name of common sense is it right to deny a similar privilege to the people in the country? I maintain that the country people are as deserving of such things as our city people. If you wish to economize, why is it that you do not incorporate the contract system in this bill for the free delivery of the mail in the large cities and towns of this country? Then at least you could have claimed to be consistent. But you want to commence your parsimony only on one class of citizens.

I do not wish to impugn the motives of members upon this great committee, but it does seem to me that it is a move toward disorganizing and destroying this great system of rural free delivery which the farmers have so much interest in, about the only thing the Government does to help make country life more desirable. Who is it that fights your battles for you? Who is it that pays 80 per cent of the taxes if it is not the people in the rural districts? And I say that whether you intend it or not, if this bill should pass it would prove the death knell of free rural delivery; and, in my humble judgment, there are some gentlemen here who would destroy that system under the pretended head of economy.

When the agricultural appropriation bill comes in here there is always some smart Alec who gets up and moves to strike out the appropriation for the small pittance to purchase seeds to send out amongst the farmers. Strange it is that there is always somebody here to fight that great class who have the burden of this Government upon their shoulders. I for one am sick and tired of hearing these silly little cries against the appropriation for these great people. I am an economist. I stand for economy; but at the same time I stand for an efficient service in the affairs of this Government. Under the contract system you can not get an efficient service. Why is it that you say it costs too much? I care not how much it costs, so we get value received, and so we give this service to the people of the country, who are always ready and willing to defend it in time of peace and in time of war, and this service will eventually pay for itself.

You may say you do not intend to cripple the service; but, my friends, the spider may not have said that he intended to eat the fly when he invited him into his parlor. So it is with you here in your cunning way. You ask men to vote for something here that will deprive the people of the country of this convenience—of this great civilizer and enlightener—which will let the people who live in the country know that we regard their wants in some other way than by sending the tax assessor and tax collector to them. Let them feel that they have an interest in this great Government as well as all of the other classes who are safely living in the great cities and towns.

Now, I do not stand up here to claim that the farmers own this country. It is not their country; it is not the lawyers' country; it is not the doctors' country; it is not the city man's country; but it is our country, and all should work together for the mutual upbuilding and benefit of each and every class. I say do not make fish of one and flesh of the other. Give to the country people the same conveniences and the same amount of money as you do to the people who live in the cities. Ah, my friends, if it was not for the sturdy yeomanry and the honest nobility who live in the country, with their conservatism and virtue, to stand out against the corruption and vice of the congested cities and towns, it does seem to me sometimes that the great Creator would have to burn it up in self-defense.

Of course I speak in a general way, because I know that thousands of good and virtuous people live in our great cities. But I say give us something that will enlighten the country, that will do justice to the country boys who are already too willing to leave the farms, to leave their homes in the country and go to the overcrowded towns and cities, where they can part their hair in the middle and wear standing collars so high as to resemble a white-washed fence around a lunatic asylum. [Laughter.] Let them stay in the country, beautify and build up their country homes and make them happy. God made the country, but man made the cities and towns. Let us take care of all of them—good, bad, and indifferent—by doing justice to all alike. [Laughter and applause.]

I am against the enactment of any such measure as this, because it means the dissolution and disarrangement and disorganization of the plan which has been adopted in establishing the carrying of the mail free to the people of this great country of ours. The farmers of this country alone have no protection. Every other class has been protected. The farmer is left alone, as it were, to battle with the soil and climate and adverse circumstances, unsophisticated as he is, knowing nothing about the tricks and traffic of trade and the whittling process of speculation, knowing nothing about the grinding and oppressive operations of trusts and combinations, but ready to do his duty as the honest yeomanry of the country, the man always ready to respond to his country's call. Then let us do him justice as well as the others. I will stand for him, and I am willing to live and die, sink or swim with him. I am opposed to this bill, which means a disarrangement of the plan which gives the farmers what they ought to have. Let the present arrangement stand as it is, at least for the present. [Loud applause.]

Mr. SWANSON. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER].

[Mr. LEVER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SWANSON. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MIERS].

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the people have more interest in this bill and the Post-Office appropriation bill than in any other that will be presented to Congress. Our mail system is unique and its degree of perfection is the wonder of everyone. It is made to serve the rich and the poor. Two cents will carry a letter to the business man on Wall street or to the cabin of the humblest citizen in the Republic. The system is being perfected until mail of all kinds is carried to the citizen farthest remote from the city as well as the closest. The general appropriation bill carries an appropriation of \$137,916,598.75 for the purpose of disseminating mail to all classes. A very important bill is the one that raises the money to be appropriated, not by direct taxation, but by a tariff. It is paid by the poor as well as the rich. All consumption is made to pay into the Treasury of the United States. The people are therefore interested in tariff bills. During the time allotted me it is not practical to fully discuss the many virtues of the mail service nor the many unjust features of the tariff that raises the revenue. I will therefore confine myself to a discussion of the tariff that in my opinion adds nothing to the revenue, but builds and protects the trusts and masses the wealth of the country in the hands of a few.

There are many questions of great importance now confronting the American people and their Representatives in Congress, such as the Philippine question, the Cuban question, the canal ques-

tion, the Chinese question, and the anarchy question, but I do not hesitate to say that none are of more importance than the question of the trusts.

In the terrifying growth and multiplication of these monopolistic combinations, and in their apparently irresistible power, resides the chief danger to the American Republic to-day. That it is a most grave danger no thinking man of patriotic fiber can deny. Even the Republican party, which is responsible for the trusts, recognizes the danger, or, at least, sees that the people recognize the danger, and, accordingly, that party has repeatedly, in its platforms, declared in one breath that the trusts must be regulated, while in the next breath it has declared for the high tariff, which alone has made the trusts possible and given them their supreme and despotic power.

The Republican party is the sole progenitor of the protective tariff; the tariff is the mother of trusts; therefore the Republican party is directly responsible for the trusts. This, Mr. Chairman, is a syllogism which is perfectly clear and logical and can be doubted or denied by no man.

But some say, Why all this tumult and panic about the trusts? What harm do they do? Do they not, on the contrary, do good? Wherein do they differ from other large business firms and companies? In so far as these are honest questions, propounded in a fair spirit, they deserve a fair answer.

In the first place, the trusts are not at all like the large business companies or corporations of former times. They differ from them not merely in dimensions, but also in their very nature and essence. Formerly a business house was formed to compete with other business houses in a certain line of commerce or production. The larger or more powerful it was, the larger and more powerful would be its competition. But even if it sought to monopolize trade in its particular line, it could rarely succeed in doing so, even for a short time, because other large and important houses would certainly spring up to dispute the field with them. Or, supposing that a house or corporation was the first in a new and unworked field, and thus had a monopoly at the start, it could not retain it long, for the same reason. Thus "competition" became and long remained the watchword of business, and it passed into a proverb that "Competition is the life of trade." And so it was. Through competition prices were regulated in a salutary and rational manner, and the people were sure of having good goods at fair prices, because if one firm tried to sell inferior goods another firm would come to the front with superior goods at the same price, or if one firm overcharged, the other competing firm would force it to come down to the proper and reasonable figures. In the same way competition acted as a conservator of good wages for laborers and employees in general. If one company tried to reduce wages, the result was soon seen in inferior work and goods, and the rival company, by keeping up the standard of wages and products, would win the lion's share of the popular patronage.

But now all this is changed by means of the trusts, and the watchword "competition" has given place to the watchword "combination" or "consolidation." The trust is not simply another business company entering the field in competition with other companies already therein. The trust is a combination of all the firms and companies and corporations in any particular line of business, so as to make one great consolidation of the many single companies or firms, and thus to stifle all competition and secure an absolute monopoly of the business. The trust not only absorbs all the separate houses and firms in that line of business, but also gets control of all the sources of supply for the goods handled in that business, and so prevents the formation of any new firms or companies outside of the trusts. It thus has the public at its mercy, so far as that line of goods is concerned. [Applause.]

This is a plain but correct statement in brief of the nature and operation of a trust, and the definition is so familiar to everybody that I should apologize for repeating it, except that it is necessary as a component part of the argument.

But the apologists for the trusts—and some of the apologists, by the way, were found in the inner circle of the Republican National Committee in 1900, and imprudently voiced their defense of the trusts at a dinner party late in the campaign, as may be remembered, greatly to the alarm of the more cautious party managers—the apologists for the trusts, I say, acknowledge the correctness of this definition, but they maintain that such combination is a good thing for the public; that it enables prices and output to be properly regulated, prevents overproduction, etc., and they even claim that it has benefited labor by increasing wages, and has benefited the purchasing community by diminishing prices.

Both of these claims are proved false by many authoritative statistical facts, including the figures of the last United States census, just published. According to the figures of the census on manufacturing, which have been completed for 33 States and

Territories, the average wages of the laborers in all the manufacturing industries have declined 8 per cent since 1890. Specifically, in those 33 States and Territories 1,004,590 wage-earners received an average of \$418.48 each per year, or \$1.39 per day, in 1890; and 1,463,365 wage-earners in these same States and Territories received an average of \$387.53 each per year, or \$1.29 per day, in 1900. This shows an average decline of 8 per cent in those years, and there is nothing unfair in the comparison, because both 1890 and 1900 were prosperous years. The period of this decline, remember, was a period when the trusts came into power and when their reign was becoming more and more supreme with every passing year, until now they have nearly every branch of industry by the throat and can do to labor whatever they will.

But this average decline of 8 per cent in wages does not tell the worst of the story, for in some of the more important manufacturing States the decline has been truly alarming. In New Jersey, for instance, we find by these same census figures that in 1890 the average wages earned in the various manufacturing industries was \$2.24 a day, and in 1900 only \$1.52 a day, thus showing a terrible decline of 32 per cent in wages in New Jersey during the ten years following 1890.

As to prices, the annual statement by Dun's Review last January is sufficiently instructive. Dun's Review, as is well known, is one of our highest commercial authorities. It is entirely unbiased and unpartisan, and its figures are accepted without question by all business men. Its careful and exhaustive compilation of the prices of the various commodities, including foods of all kinds, clothing, metals, and all other commodities, on January 1, 1902, as compared with 1900 and 1890, shows that the cost of living, as gauged by these prices, is nearly 7 per cent higher now than in 1900, and more than 11 per cent higher than in 1890. Here we have an increase of 11 per cent in the prices of the necessities of life and a decrease of 8 per cent in wages since 1890 as a result of the practical operations of the trusts. What a commentary is this on the "jolly" given to the laboring men of this country by Mr. Carnegie and other trust magnates, when they declare, as Mr. Carnegie recently declared in a meeting of railroad employees, that "under present conditions the wages of labor tend to rise and the prices of the necessities of life tend to fall!" What nerve this displays, Mr. Chairman, when every man and woman in the country who buys anything knows that prices are now very high, and higher than formerly; that food of all kinds is high, coal high, wood high, furniture and clothing high, and that work is not as well paid as it was a few years ago.

The trusts control not only the wages and prices but also the output. The apologists say that the trusts regulate the output according to the demand. No doubt they can do so if they wish, but they can also keep the output far below the demand, and thus send up prices, or they can even set high prices for their products irrespective of the demand and irrespective of the supply, and that is just what they are doing now. Take coal, for example. The coal trust has been setting prices arbitrarily all through the season. For instance, last summer it was given out that the price of such and such coal should be at such and such a figure until, say, November, when it would be raised to such and such a higher figure. Sure enough, when the time came the price was raised by proclamation. And in this month or next month it may be raised again by a similar arbitrary proclamation. These prices are established by the trust at its own sweet will. No reference is made as to the output. The public does not know whether coal is plenty or scarce. The trust mines as much or as little as it chooses and sets whatever price it chooses. The public must have coal: it must take the coal furnished by the trust; there is no other coal to be had; the coal trust, therefore, has the public absolutely beneath its heel.

Not only so, but the trust also dictates what kind of coal the public shall buy. In former times if a purchaser bought a ton of Lackawanna and did not like it, he might try next time a ton of, say, Lehigh. But now certain kinds of coal are shipped to certain sections, and those sections must have their particular kind of coal or none. An illustration of this fact came to my notice in central New York last autumn. In one of the towns on the line of the Delaware and Hudson Railroad a citizen who had just settled there and knew nothing of the local coal market ordered a ton of coal, and on trial it proved not precisely satisfactory. Accordingly when he went to get a second ton he asked the dealer for another kind, but the dealer informed him that there was only one kind to be had in that town or in any of the other towns served by that railroad, namely, the Delaware and Hudson Lackawanna coal; that the railroad would not transport any other coal except at prohibitive rates of freight. Inquiry of other dealers confirmed his statement.

This illustration shows the practical working of the trusts. They dictate what the citizen shall buy and the prices he shall pay. There is no escape from it. There is no competition, no opportunity for him to exercise selection or choice. If one dealer's

goods or prices seem unsatisfactory to him, there is no use in his going to another dealer, for there he will find the same goods and the same prices, all dictated by the oppressive, despotic, merciless, almighty trusts. There is nothing to hinder the trusts from sending up the prices of all the necessities of life to-morrow 10 per cent or 100 per cent; nothing to hinder them from charging \$100 a ton for coal, or \$100 for a barrel of flour, or \$1 a pound for writing paper, or \$1 a pound for sugar. The trusts have grown so bold and so confident that they seem to have very little fear left, very little sense of responsibility, very little disposition to restrain themselves. They are not afraid of the courts. They are not afraid of Congress or the Administration of the Government, so long as the Republican party is in control. The only thing they are still a little afraid of—the only thing that still tends to restrain them within decent bounds—is the fury of the people. The trusts are putting on the screws as tightly as they think the public will stand it, and they would tighten them still further if they were not afraid of arousing a public sentiment that would put an end to their way of doing business. [Applause.]

There are now at least 400 trusts in the United States, capitalized at the enormous figure of about \$7,000,000,000. Many of these combinations are comparatively small. Many are only partial in their control, and many are simply local. But the number of the big trusts, reaching all over the country and in nearly every case absolutely controlling their several commodities, is nearly 100; and among the products thus monopolized and practically removed from competition are sugar, oil, linseed oil, beef and other meat products, whisky, beer, tobacco, malt, the telephone, pottery, wire, tin plate, iron and steel manufactures, copper manufactures, electrical manufactures, celluloid ware, baking powder, biscuits, flour, shot and lead manufactures, leather goods, rubber goods, brooms, matches, paper, silver plate, coal, lumber, cement, corundum, salt, varnish, kodaks, coffins, mirrors, wall paper, elevators, safes, refrigerators, sash and doors, shovels, print cloths, dyewoods, envelopes, window shades, and hosiery. Think of all these articles and many others under the control of a comparatively few men, each industry dominated by a single corporation or a few corporations acting in combination with all these billions of dollars at their backs! Think of all these necessities of life being completely removed from the field of healthy business competition, and their prices fixed arbitrarily by a few capitalists in order to distend still further their already enormous fortunes at the expense of the toiling, poverty-stricken masses!

But it may be said, "What can be done? Where is there a remedy to be found? Now that these trusts have been legally established, how can they be legally dislodged or their evils counteracted without public disorder or violence?" Yes, there is a way, and the sooner it is followed the better. As the tariff is responsible for the trusts, so the reformation of tariff abuses and inequalities will give the death blow to the trusts. The trusts have stifled competition in the United States because the tariff on the products controlled by them in this country has been prohibitive of the entrance of similar foreign-made products at lower prices, and consequently our own American purchasers and consumers are compelled to pay whatever prices the trusts may command them to pay. Only let competition come in from abroad, and a hole would at once be made in the trust balloon, and down it would come to the ground in the twinkling of an eye, with disaster to all its inflated highfliers. [Applause.]

More than that, much more than that, by cutting off the tariff, which has fostered the monopoly of the trusts, competition may be secured once again at home, and without such competition from abroad or at home, or both, the country can never be happy or safe or really prosperous, for competition is the paramount law of industrial life. The apparent prosperity of the present day is neither genuine nor general. There is undoubtedly great, tremendous, very unjustly disproportionate prosperity to comparatively few. But it is confined to those who are on the inside of the trusts. This favored class of financial aristocrats is getting fabulously rich at a rapid pace, but the employees of the trusts are not getting rich, the laboring people of the country are not getting rich, the small merchants are not getting rich. As I have shown, the wage earners are getting less wages now than ten years ago, and the cost of living is greater now than then. Surely a corporation that is strong enough to dictate terms to 80,000,000 people can get along without protection for the sake of protection.

It is significant to notice, by the way, that nearly one-half of the trusts have been chartered during the last two years, which is the very period when the greatest advance in the prices of the necessities of life took place; and now the country is menaced by the worst trust of all—the grand climacteric of the trusts—the pending money trust, which actually proposes to get hold of and control the money of the country, and will do so if not checked in some way. The immense power wielded by the consolidation of all our leading money interests and multimillionaires into one

concentrated money syndicate may perhaps be faintly and approximately imagined, but the actual realization of its disastrous consequences would not come to the people until the power of the syndicate had been firmly established, and then it would be too late to escape from its remorseless clutches. Such a syndicate could and would secure a monopoly of all the country's banking and money lending and borrowing, and would manipulate the United States Treasury at its pleasure. It would come to this, that a few rich men would own the country, as the trusts practically own it now.

This money syndicate would be nothing more than the logical result of the trust system now in vogue. The system may be compared to an ever-narrowing centrifugal motion. At first all the industries are seen revolving around freely in the business world, like the planets, comets, and asteroids of the solar system. Then one consolidation takes place, and the revolution becomes narrower and more contracted, and then another consolidation, and then others, with less and less freedom and scope of revolution, until all the separate individuals of the system are finally consolidated into one, all the forces of mutual attraction and repulsion are dissipated, all balance lost, and the whole system, thus broken up and ruined by consolidation, falls into the fiery central sun and is annihilated.

In other words, every consolidation narrows the field of competition and restricts trade. The more competitors the better. This is the universal, essential law of healthy business life.

The best way to strike at the trusts, I repeat, is through the tariff. The tariff is the mother of trusts, and the trusts can not live without the continued sustenance derived from their mother tariff. The tariff should be so reduced as to let in foreign competition along all lines controlled by the trusts, and as demanded by the Kansas City platform. It is not alone the Democrats of the United States who perceive this necessity. We have abundant Republican authority of a very high order for making this demand. The great Republican financier and leader, John Sherman, on the 15th of October, 1888, said in the Senate:

Whenever this free competition is evaded or avoided by combinations of individuals or corporations, the duties should be reduced and foreign competition invited.

On August 26, 1890, Senator Plumb, of Kansas, in a speech delivered against the then pending tariff bill, said:

There are dozens of lines of manufactures covered by the terms of this bill which are controlled by trusts. I do not know of any better way to start in, at least to reduce the exactions of the trusts, than to cut down the shelter behind which trusts are created.

The late Governor Mount, of Indiana, in December, 1899, in a public speech, said:

I emphatically favor removing all tariff protection from every industry that belongs to a combination in restraint of trade.

Republican sentiment in that direction is not confined to former days. There is plenty of it in this present Congress, and it will yet make itself heard in spite of gag laws, framed by Republican autocrats in behalf of their friends and allies, the trusts. The bill of the Republican member from Wisconsin to reduce the duties on iron and steel is a step in the right direction. The latest reports from the steel trust, officially issued not long ago, show that that corporation is making 10 per cent on its nominal capitalization of about \$1,300,000,000—making a net profit, it is said, of about \$120,000,000 a year. But it has been proved that fully three-quarters of the capital of this monstrous and bloated concern is water, so that in reality the trust is making \$120,000,000 a year on an actual capital of about \$400,000,000, or in reality about 30 per cent.

No wonder the directors and other insiders of this trust feel jubilant and hug themselves as they reflect upon their golden future prospects of making more than a hundred millions a year by selling a ton of steel rails to our own people for \$28 and to the English people for \$21, and by other transactions of a similar nature. It is our extraordinarily high tariff that enables the trusts to do such things—and they are all doing so, as they have opportunity—making money by overcharging the American people; and they are enabled to overcharge by reason of the high tariff, which keeps up an artificial level of prices in this country and keeps out foreign competition. I know it will be said that in this case the price of steel rails is higher in England than it is here. It has been so, I grant, occasionally for brief periods during the last three or four years, but it is not so normally. And even if it were so always, is that any justification for the continuation of the tariff on steel? Is it not rather the best argument for its discontinuance? If we can make steel rails cheaper than England or any other foreign country, what is the use of the tariff? Its only effect is to keep prices up higher than they ought to be in this country, so that our own steel trust can have a pretext for continuing their home price \$28 a ton, while secretly selling to England at \$21 a ton.

I have taken the steel trust as an example. But any of the

other trusts would have done as well. They are alike. They are all made possible by the stifling of competition through combination and consolidation in this country and through the shutting off of competition from other countries by a high tariff. They are all fattening themselves on the lifeblood of the American people by wringing money out of them to pay the high prices made possible by the tariff; and many of them, like the steel trust, sell their manufactures for lower prices abroad than at home. This is true in the case of our American-made agricultural implements, which can be bought in South America or in Canada for less money than our own farmers are charged for them. It is true also of our oil machinery, which, as the gentleman from North Carolina reminded us the other day, is sold cheaper to the people living on the shores of the Caspian Sea than to our own oil producers in Texas.

Is not such a state of things monstrous, Mr. Chairman? It only goes to show what a monstrous thing our high tariff is. The tariff was originally formed with the very idea of shutting off foreign competition for the benefit of our home industry; but it was understood as a matter of course that competition at home should be as free as air. The most radical supporters of the protective theory in former times would never have dreamed of preventing all competition at home. Yet it is now seen that the vicious and dangerous protective system had within it all the time the germ fatal to all competition which has now ripened and bloomed forth into the poisonous flower of the trusts. It is now evident to all that the unavoidable tendency of the present tariff is toward monopolies, and at the present day the only ones who appear in defense of the tariff are those who are interested in the monopolistic trusts or expect to be benefited by them. The Republican party, I declare without hesitation, is the party of the trusts. It is kept alive by them, and in turn is doing its best to keep them alive. It depends upon the trusts for its sinews of war, and without the aid of the trusts it would not have succeeded in the campaign of 1900. That is as well settled as any fact recorded in history since the creation of the world.

Aside from a revision and reduction of the tariff, cutting off or reducing the duties on articles handled by the trusts, there is another repressive measure that ought to be adopted, which would materially diminish the power of the trusts for evil. That is, that a hole should be made in them to let all the water out. [Applause.] No doubt three-quarters of all the trusts' stocks is water. There is no need to dilate upon the harmfulness of such a state of things. Every corporation should be compelled to have all its capital paid up and all its stock paid for at par. This requisition would make most of the trusts "die a bornin'." Here the tariff comes in again. As has been well said by another:

The tariff is undoubtedly indirectly responsible for a large part of the water in trust stocks. Had there been no tariff to enable prospective trusts to pay dividends on watered stocks, trust promoters could not have offered sufficient inducements to excite the naturally antagonistic producers in any particular industry. Not only, then, is the tariff responsible for many trusts, but it is responsible for much of the water in trust stocks. That this is true is evident not only from the fact that the most highly protected trusts are generally the most highly capitalized, but from the fact that promoters have been unable to form trusts in many industries not actually benefited by tariff duties.

I could easily multiply instances of the effect of the trusts on raising prices in this country. The case of printing paper is one of the clearest and most striking. It was said when the paper trust was formed that it would infallibly lower prices. Instead of that, all the promises of the trust in that respect have been broken, and the price of printing paper is at least 25 per cent higher than it was before the trust was formed. The same story is to be told about a hundred other commodities. The great evils incident to these cases have been due to the operation of the tariff. If there had been no tariff, creating an artificial standard of prices and keeping out the world's goods, there could have been no trusts; at least, no trusts absolutely controlling the various articles of production. If trusts are to exist at all, they should be subjected to competition with the whole world.

One of the worst of the trusts—not mentioned at all in the lists of trusts—is the great railroad trust of this country. It is not yet fully formed. It is in process of formation. Every year sees the consolidation process further advanced and the number of great combined lines increasing and bound together by "community of interest," instead of being competitors, as formerly. These great railroad combinations are supposed to be held in check by the interstate-commerce law and Commission; but the reports of the Commission have always been made up principally of details of violations of the law and a general bewailing of the impotency of the Commission to enforce their decrees. By discriminating freight rates in favor of big monopolies like the Standard Oil Company or the coal combine, these railroads assist in the building up of trusts in this country and in crushing small competitors. But if there were no big trusts for the railroads to cater to, the temptation to discrimination would become much

less. In the final report of the Industrial Commission, Commissioner Phillips, himself a Republican, in the course of a striking supplementary statement, gives the following startling estimate of the present dimensions of our American monopolistic combinations:

American railroads, whose monopoly character is becoming more apparent, are stocked and bonded for about \$11,500,000,000, and had net earnings from operation after paying taxes, 1900-1901, of \$507,968,710. This means that these securities are to-day worth in the market over \$10,000,000,000. If we add to this the \$4,000,000,000 of water, gas, electric-light, street-railway, and telephone securities, probably worth that much in the market, and the \$3,000,000,000 of securities of our largest so-called trusts, to say nothing of the telegraph, there looms up a valuation of industries, more or less monopolistic in character, of \$17,000,000,000, or probably one-fifth of what the present census will find to be the estimated true value of all property in this country. This monopolistic growth has come about almost entirely since 1860.

It should be added that fully four-fifths of this monopolistic growth has arisen since 1890, for in the earlier years of the period subsequent to 1860 the railway, telegraph, water, gas, and telephone enterprises, etc., however large they may have been, were in no sense monopolistic.

But they say the trusts are under the law; they are under control; they can not overstep the bounds of justice and propriety; they are in the public eye—in the light of publicity. Publicity, Mr. Chairman, is not enough. The trusts care nothing for the results of publicity. They have no shame. They care nothing as to what the people think about them, so long as they are let alone. If a true statement of their accounts is too glaring, too self-condemnatory, they can issue a falsified account. They are not too squeamish for a little thing like that. The depredations of the trusts are the worst kind of robbing our own poor people, the people who make this Republic what it is, and who by their votes have given the trusts the means of existence and growth and prosperity, robbing the people of this country in order that they, the over-rich trust magnates, may get still richer by absorbing the hard-earned pittance and savings of the poor. [Applause.]

No; publicity is not enough. The people know well enough what is going on. They see the trust evil and the trust danger, but they do not know how to prevent it. Restore competition; that is the way to prevent it. And how restore competition? By cutting off or reducing the tariff on the trust-made goods.

But our friends on the other side say: "We passed an amended and strengthened antitrust law in this House less than two years ago. How, then, can you charge us with being favorable to the trusts?" Oh, yes; we know all about that. That was a species of confidence game—a political "little joker." Such a transaction as that inflicts upon the victims not only an injury but an insult. In this case the act itself was bad enough, but the insult consists in trying to palm it off upon the public as a sincere act. What did that legislation amount to? The Republicans of the House brought forward this antitrust bill at the last moment—within a few days of final adjournment—and passed it, well knowing that it would be held up in the Senate, and so it was.

As soon as it reached the Senate the Republican leaders there began to pick it to pieces and find flaws in it, and it was at once sagely decided that it was too faulty a bill and too important a piece of legislation to put through without more time for examination and amendment than then remained in the session. As everybody knows, it was merely a piece of campaign buncombe. Before the next session began the campaign was over, the election had been held, the Republican Administration had been continued in power, the object of this spurious Republican onslaught on the trusts had been gained, and when the Senate reassembled the antitrust bill was quietly deposited in the darkest corner of the darkest pigeonhole obtainable, there to remain till the resurrection day, or till the Republicans need it for material in another campaign. [Applause.] The founder of the Democratic party, Thomas Jefferson, was the author of the immortal Declaration of Independence. Opposition to imperialism was one of the cardinal principles of the Republic as well as the Democratic party. Until of late wherever the flag floated it was the emblem of a free government and constitutional liberty. The Republican policy is to use the power of a government to further the interest of individuals.

The evidence is overwhelming that it is not safe to give so much power to private corporations as has been given to the trusts, railroad combines, and other combinations in this country of late. Nor is it safe to intrust the guardianship of the public welfare to the Republican party, which has become the special protector of private and privileged corporations and the foster-mother of monopolies.

Even if this wonderful Republican antitrust bill of 1900 had been genuine and had become a law, what good would it have done? What good has the original antitrust law of 1890 done? What good have all the threatened antitrust bills of both parties since then done? What good have the antitrust platform declarations of both parties done? In spite of all these demonstrations the trusts have gone right along multiplying and growing and waxing exceeding mighty. Even when brought up before a bar

of justice on indictment, as has occasionally happened to a trust, some easy way of slipping out of the difficulty has generally been found. But as soon as you make free competition again possible by cutting off their high tariff protection you send a shot through the trusts below the water line, and they will sink to the bottom. [Applause.]

Fortunately there is reason to believe that the people, the source of power and the final arbiters of all our national questions, are beginning to see this matter in its true light. Unless all signs of the times are misleading, the next Congressional elections will be rather in the nature of a surprise party to you gentlemen on the Republican side. There is considerable ground for the suspicion that you are not as happy as you were a few months ago. Even on the tariff, the corner stone of the Republican party, you are not agreed any longer. How about the Cuban tariff? How about the Philippine tariff? How about the war-revenue tax? How about the Babcock bill? Only sixteen months ago you marched up to the polls a solid phalanx, united on the tariff and on all other questions at issue. But now, only the other day, you had to make a special, novel, ironclad rule forbidding your own men to offer amendments to a committee bill on the floor of this House, this free arena of the Representatives of the people of the United States. What has happened to scare you so? What is the matter? Do you hear the rising of the wind in the West? Do you discern a cloud gathering on the horizon? Do you remember what the people have done to you on some other occasions when you were in power and abused your trust? Are you afraid that what has happened once may happen again?

Certainly it may, and it will. The people of this country are long-suffering, but they will not be fooled and abused forever and ever. They are not going to be trust-ridden henceforth forevermore. They are not going to look on supinely while the Republic is transformed into an oligarchy. Thank God, the people have the supreme power in this country. The trusts, under the protection of the Republican party, which hypocritically pretends to be the people's friend, have stolen a march on the public, but it is not yet too late to repair the mischief and repel the enemy. Let the people once become fully cognizant of the danger, and of the only means of counteracting it, and they will rush with irresistible force to the defense of their liberties and the common weal, and before the onset of that tremendous popular indignation the discredited Republican party and its monstrous progeny, the trusts, will go down into ruin together. [Applause.]

Mr. SWANSON. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] and my colleague from Indiana [Mr. CROMER] in that they have been able to carry, as by a tempest, all before them in their advocacy of the rural free-delivery service as it at present exists. A Democrat and a Republican are thus seen jointly acting together to overturn the decision of the Post-Office Committee, of which they are members.

This committee, composed of 11 Republicans and 7 Democrats, by almost a unanimous vote in committee, reported favorably a bill to change the carrier service to a system of competitive bidding, and claim in support of it that it will secure a more economical administration, and hence a larger portion and a greater number of routes to the people in the country. It is clear that the House is not at this time in favor of the change, however much it may usually defer to the distinguished chairman of that committee and to the able members making this report. This proposed change is already defeated. It is evident to all on this floor who are observant that its defeat only awaits the taking of the vote.

How have the gentlemen been able to accomplish this result? Only by reason of the friendliness for the service on the part of every member here, a friendliness that has repeatedly found expression in vote and in statements on the floor, all evidencing that each member is equal to any other in his desire to promote it. I congratulate the House that during these discussions no question of partisanship has marred it, no credit to one party or another has been claimed, and thus politics has been submerged and patriotism has held its sway on this important question in the House of Representatives. I congratulate the farming community on the splendid rural-delivery service we have in its present form and under its present regulations.

Mr. Chairman, some statements have been made against the Post-Office Committee, which has already lost its cause in court. I do not share in these, or in any charges against the patriotism of any member of the Post-Office Committee. These charges will be softened and disproved by sober judgment and time. To the distinguished chairman of that committee I accord this just praise—that for ability, sturdy honesty, and supreme independence he stands the equal of any gentleman on the floor. To other members of the committee I pay equal tribute.

Mr. Chairman, this rural-delivery system in all its splendor, from its small beginning to its mature form, has been painted in glowing colors by the brush of finished and able artists on both sides of the House until this Hall has been vocal with a unanimous verdict as to the efficiency and utility of this service. No man can stand upon the floor and challenge any colleague from any quarter and charge him with indifference or deny that he is equal to any other in his advocacy of this splendid system, to which I accord the highest praise.

But we are threatened with a real danger, a danger that strikes at the vitals of the system itself, and, in my judgment, only one real danger, and that is that politics may be played by weak and designing people throughout the country at the expense of the service. That it has been played goes without question, not by the Department here—I excuse them from such a charge—but by others. I believe the Department means to make it a business service, and one which the people, being equally taxed to support, shall have an equal benefit from. Two years ago, upon the floor of the House, among the Democrats I alone defended the Department against the charge of partisanship and uttered the sentiment, speaking for the service in my district, that "it had not been used for politics or for partisan ends."

I am sorry to say that since then I have had some experience on the subject, not with those who had the regulation of it in the departments, but among those politicians who would prostitute the most splendid system this Government has ever devised, in my judgment, to partisan ends. This service stands to the farmer as does the telephone, the electric light and car in industrial development. Why try to inject politics into it? You can not do so and strengthen it. Nor can you do it with good effect to yourselves. The remedy is by placing the civil-service ban full and complete over the service. The President has already reproached such of his followers as would play politics with this people's service. He placed it under a system, but not under the old line civil service. It is not there now, fully and effectively. To my colleagues from the South who, prior to February 1, 1902, were favored in the appointment of carriers in their districts, I will say that they have taken only what it was originally promised they should have when the rural free delivery was first started, and that which its first promoters promised that it should be—a nonpartisan service.

I make no charge against them for having gotten their friends or their political associates to carry the mails. Each of us of the North would have done likewise, in my judgment; and especially should they have that right under the rule that it should be a nonpartisan service, which was the dream of its promoters. In the interest of fair play and to promote this department service you should aid us to place the civil-service rules fully and completely over this system or it will be threatened by a menace which will tend to dwarf it in certain sections in the course of time. You will be the sufferers when that time comes.

Therefore I shall contend, when the bill is taken up by paragraphs, that we place the civil-service law, by proper amendment, over this department, and I hope that the Southern members, my Democratic colleagues, will profit by the splendid exhibition of nonpartisanship shown always when this subject is presented in the House, and join in favor of that policy.

I hope that my friends from the South, who have received one-third, one-half, and two-thirds of the carriers under the system in vogue in that section before February, will see that the Northern districts, which you must carry if you carry the House of Representatives, shall be protected in their rural free delivery against the evils of partisanship in the establishment of it, and that the service itself shall be rescued from its pretended friends, who are trying to play politics with it. Come to Ohio, come to Illinois, come to Indiana, and to my district in the time of the sear and yellow leaf, in the autumn election, and we will give you an exhibition of partisanship and party politics in our campaigns that will make you walk in your sleep, you Southern members.

It is in such States that the politician who cares more for politics than he does for public service—it is there that he likes to revel in the clover of official machinery to accomplish political ends. Under this system prior to February of this year you Southern members were given these rural carriers, but none came to the Northern or Western States or to the close districts of the North, East, and West. We may be subjected to political pernicious activity, and we ask you to protect us by placing the civil-service law completely over this system. Every precedent is favorable to this action. Look at the various departments of the Government under civil service. This department was placed under what is styled a modified or reformed civil service. The President did this before we raised the salary.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] says that if the present rules are enforced it will be sufficient to secure protection in some manner similar to the civil-service law. As has been lucidly stated here by gentlemen, there is opportunity for evasion.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] says that it does not now secure the full results. Other gentlemen, including the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON], say it may not secure satisfactory results. You can appreciate the position we are in and can readily see where the good of the service lies. We have more politics in Indiana in one district in elections than you have in an entire State almost.

In my district there are 45,000 votes cast, one for every three and six-tenths person. We ask you of the South to aid to fortify this magnificent and valuable service under the system of carriers as it is now, so that it can not be prostituted to political ends by anyone in official or in unofficial station. This will be accomplished by covering it with the full civil-service blanket. So provide that when anyone seeks to injure it by making it a political machine the full civil-service penalties will be visited upon him. We will risk it under the civil-service rules and take our chances, and at once we would preserve and fortify the system.

Mr. Chairman, nothing would so poison the system of rural free delivery as partisan control. I speak only for the good of the system itself. As to those in office who may try to so use it, I verily believe that the result to them will be such as will cause them to pray for relief from their partisan friends. [Applause.]

Mr. SWANSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CONNER].

[Mr. CONNER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SWANSON. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TATE].

Mr. TATE. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to this debate, and I am glad to note the almost unanimous approval of the rural free-delivery service which is now being adopted and put in force in the different sections of the country. Even the advocates of this bill disclaim any purpose of crippling the rural free-delivery service, and give as their reason for the passage of this bill, not their objection to the rural free-delivery system, but, first, the fear of interference and control by the rural carriers of the Congressional elections; and, second, the amount of salary paid or to be paid to these rural free-delivery carriers.

Now, sir, I do not believe that these objections are well founded. I do not believe that the rural free-delivery carriers in any section of this country could dictate to the members of Congress or to the people that they serve. The Congressman who discharges his duty, in my opinion, need not fear the influence of these rural carriers with the people along the routes they serve, and I am surprised, sir, at the importance given in this debate to this point. Why, sir, gentlemen would have us believe that the people along the routes could be influenced and controlled by the carriers, and that the Congressmen would be required to do the bidding of these carriers or would receive the condemnation of the people to whom the carriers deliver the mail. They can wield no such influence; the people can not be controlled or used for any such purpose. The Congressman who favors just and legitimate legislation and discharges his duty faithfully and loyally will not be required to do the bidding of the rural free-delivery carriers by voting for increase in their salaries, nor will the people be influenced by these carriers by reason of the fact that he refuses to vote for such increase. I have a higher opinion, Mr. Chairman, of the people of the rural districts than to believe as these gentlemen do.

Mr. Chairman, I am as much in favor of economy as any member on this floor; and since I have had the honor to represent my people here I have on every occasion insisted on reducing appropriations and in appropriating only such sums from the Federal Treasury as were absolutely necessary for the economic administration of the affairs of this Government, but I must admit my surprise in this day of extravagance at the effort of the Post-Office Committee to change the manner of distributing the mail on the rural free-delivery routes, when in so many instances increase of salaries are being given to the employees in the different departments of the Government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are told that by the contract system of letting these rural free-delivery routes to the lowest bidder we can save money and not injure the service. I deny both of these propositions. In the first place, no man can furnish his own horse and buggy and travel 25 miles every day delivering the mails through the country who is competent to give competent and efficient service, and do so for less than five or six hundred dollars a year. He furnishes and feeds his own horse, and also furnishes his own buggy and harness, and I undertake to say that you can not hire a horse and buggy in any section of the country for less than \$1 per day. But say that it can be got for \$25 a month. This would take one-half of the salary for horse and buggy hire alone, and would allow the carrier, who is paid \$50 a month, \$25 for his services. But suppose he furnishes his own horse and buggy at a cost of \$150. His horse and buggy at the end of the year would

be worth a great deal less, if anything at all, than when he began the service. I doubt whether after using his horse and buggy on a route 25 miles long he could realize anything for his buggy, and believe he would get little for his horse. But say that his horse and buggy, if he owns them himself, cost him \$10 per month—and it would cost him \$8 or \$10 a month to feed and keep his horse, repair his buggy and harness—this would give him \$30 a month.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe it is extravagance to pay this sum to the man who goes, day in and day out, without regard to weather, over these routes delivering the mails to the people. Why, sir, we pay in the cities \$800 for delivering the mails. These carriers work eight hours a day and have no duties to perform except delivering or taking up the mails; they do not have the postmaster's responsibilities, as have the rural carriers; and while, as has been stated in this debate, it costs more for them to live in the cities possibly, yet, while they receive \$200 more pay than the rural carriers, they do not furnish, as the rural carrier does, any conveyance, but only give their time in this service.

Mr. Chairman, the proposition of the committee is to change the present manner of appointing rural free-delivery carriers to the contract system.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have heretofore discussed in detail the contract system of carrying the mails on the star routes of this country, and I will not undertake to do so again at this time, for my position upon that question is already well understood, and I am glad that hereafter we are to have these star-route contracts let only to local bidders. Under the present bill it is proposed to adopt a contract system for carrying and delivering the mails on the rural free-delivery routes. The present law for letting contracts for carrying the mails on star routes provides that—

All contracts for carrying the mails are to be in the name of the United States and shall be awarded to the lowest bidder tendering sufficient guaranties for the faithful performance, etc.

You will see, Mr. Chairman, that under the present law when contract is let for carrying the mails on a star route sufficient guaranties for "faithful performance" are required; and I see that the requirements under this bill for carrying the mails on rural free-delivery routes are as follows:

who shall tender sufficient guaranties that he will personally perform capable service.

If this bill is passed, it will give to the people the same "faithful performance" that they are now receiving under the contract system for carrying the mails on the star routes. I do not believe, sir, that a more objectionable system could be devised than the present system of carrying the mail on the star routes of this country. Rather than adopt this objectionable system of carrying the mails on the rural free-delivery routes, I would give my support to a proposition to abolish the present contract system of carrying the mails and authorize the Post-Office Department to pay a reasonable compensation for efficient service.

If we can not secure "faithful performance" of contracts for carrying the mails where the carriers only receive the mail pouch from one postmaster and deliver it to another, how can we hope to have efficient service when we combine the postmaster and carrier in one and the same person? For the rural free-delivery carrier is a traveling postmaster; he performs all of the duties of the postmaster, and there would be just as much reason in letting the post-offices to the lowest bidder as there would be in letting contracts to carry the mails and act as traveling postmaster—which the rural free-delivery carrier does—with the exception that in the case of letting the post-offices you would not couple with it the present objectionable system of carrying the mails on star routes, which this bill proposes to couple with the rural-carrier system.

If we adopt this bill and require these contracts to be let to the lowest bidder, we will have the same class of service on the rural free-delivery routes that we are now receiving under the star-route contract system. We will have the same poor old one-eyed horse, the same old run-down cart, the same late mails, and the same old complaints at the Post-Office Department that we now receive under the star-route system, and the poorest possible service on every route.

Mr. Chairman, if the present rural free-delivery service is perfected and put in operation in the rural districts of this country it means a great deal to the people living in the country; it will add to the comfort and pleasure of the farmer and his family and increase the value of his property, and I feel that instead of adopting the contract system proposed by this bill, which would retard, in my opinion, rather than advance this system, we should provide for a sufficient force for inspecting and laying out these rural free-delivery routes; for the only complaint I have received from the people of my district in regard to rural free delivery, and from those who do not now have satisfactory mail facilities is the delay of the Department in acting upon petitions filed for

the establishment of rural mail service. I feel, sir, that the rural free-delivery service should not only be extended from railroad stations, as is now being done by the Department, but that it should be adopted in counties that are not touched by railroads. For the people residing away from the railroad stations, along with their neighbors residing near railroads, should be given their mail in the shortest possible time.

Mr. Chairman, few of the appropriations made by Congress are expended directly for the benefit of the people of the rural districts. They pay their taxes, are among our most upright and law-abiding citizens, and it does seem to me, sir, that we should give to this class of our fellow-citizens the very best possible mail facilities. [Loud applause.]

Mr. SWANSON. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. BRUNDIDGE].

Mr. BRUNDIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I confidently believe that the placing of these mail carriers under the contract system will give a service just as efficient and at much less cost than the present plan. Hence I shall support this bill. More than once during the debate that has been going on here for the past week gentlemen have hooted at the idea of cheapness in the Government service, and have derided the very suggestion of economy. Upon this line they need have no fears, for if they have discovered anything cheap in what this Congress has done up to the present time or proposes to do until the end of it, they have observed something which has not fallen under my observation. In view of the fact that it is understood that this bill is to be followed by the General Post-Office appropriation bill, and as this is one of the large appropriation bills that passes this House annually, and, in my judgment, a great deal of the money appropriated by it is uselessly and unnecessarily wasted, I deem it a proper time and place to call attention to the growing tendency to higher and increased appropriations each year and wasteful and almost criminal extravagance. The Fifty-first Congress startled the entire country by expending a billion dollars, and yet if this one, the Fifty-seventh, keeps up the pace it is going and makes the appropriations called for and demanded by this Administration, we will double that sum and go down into history as the two-billion-dollar Congress.

The first session of the Fifty-first Congress, in making the appropriations for the year of 1891, appropriated for the—

Army only	\$24,206,471
Navy	24,136,035
Post-Office	72,226,698
Pensions	123,779,368

Compare these sums with what we are now doing. The first session of this Congress is asked to expend for the Army about \$130,000,000. This is more than five times the sum expended in 1891, and one of the consequences of the increase of the Army to maintain our foreign policy. We are expected to appropriate for the Navy about one hundred million, about four times greater than the usual appropriation, and so great that business associations and the people are sending their written and printed petitions to members of this Congress protesting against this enormous increase. To this must be added \$131,000,000 for postal expenses. This has almost doubled in the past ten years—another considerable and unnecessary increase. While the report of the honorable Commissioner of Pensions for last year shows that the total number of pensioners on the rolls was 1,041,321, or 4,000 in excess of any previous year, and adds that "this constitutes high-water mark in the history of this Bureau," and will require about one hundred and fifty million more to pay these. The Commissioner should be reminded that his Bureau is only keeping pace with the rapid strides of the others; and bear in mind the fact that under this rule of wild Republican extravagance it is still raining, and he may expect high water and a still greater rise, and that, too, at an early date. These are only a few of the appropriations to be made. When the long list is completed and then doubled for the next session of the present Congress, you get the grand total of money to be spent in the way of ordinary governmental expenses.

High as these figures are we are given to understand that they do not represent all, for this Congress is expected to pass the ship-subsidy bill, by which between one hundred and sixty and two hundred million dollars more shall be paid out of the Treasury. In other words, \$200,000,000 is to be taken from the taxpayers of the country and turned over to the shipowners in order that they may be enabled to carry on their own private business for their own private gain to a better advantage. Every unprejudiced mind will condemn such an act as unfair and unjust, for if Government aid is to be extended to build up one business, why withhold it from another? To-day we are building and exporting into foreign countries railway locomotives. Pass this bill and in a short while you may expect those engaged in the construction thereof to discover that they can not build these in competition with other countries without being paid a bounty from the United States Treasury.

And so it will be with every other concern that feels like it is strong enough to hold up the Government and claim its aid.

But, Mr. Chairman, who are the promoters of this scheme, and who are to be the real beneficiaries from its consummation? They are by no means beginners, but old and experienced veterans who have had their hands in the public Treasury in the past and still have them there. The statement has been published time after time that the corporation to derive the greatest benefit from the passage of this subsidy bill will be the International Navigation Company. The directors of this corporation—some of them at least—are also directors of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company, and one of them, Mr. A. J. Cassatt, is the president of this road, while others of the directors are connected with the Standard Oil Company and kindred organizations. So it is in reality but another effort of the railway companies and their owners to have the doors of the Treasury opened a little wider and held there for fifteen years, until they can take out two hundred million more. Let us see how these railway companies have fared in the past at the hands of Congress. We have no record on our national statutes of their ever having met with failure and defeat in any of their attempted schemes, but we have abundant proof of the fact that they have always been successful.

Let me briefly call attention to some of their past efforts from 1850 to 1872. Congress granted to the different railroad companies more than 200,000,000 acres of the public lands; about 100,000,000 acres of these lands have already been patented to them, and between sixty and seventy million acres more will be patented. If we value this land at the low average price of \$5 per acre, we find that in twenty-two years they got an absolute donation from Congress of more than \$800,000,000. I herewith append a statement showing the date and the amount of each of these grants and the company to whom the grant was made. In many instances these land grants amounted to a sum large enough to both build and equip the road.

Date of act.	Name of road.	Acres.
Sept. 20, 1850	Illinois Central.....	2,595,053
Do.....	Mobile and Chicago.....	
Do.....	Mobile and Ohio River.....	
Aug. 11, 1856	Vicksburg and Meridian.....	404,800
Sept. 20, 1850	Mobile and Ohio River.....	230,400
May 17, 1856	Alabama and Florida.....	419,520
June 3, 1856	Selma, Rome and Dalton.....	481,920
May 23, 1872	Coosa and Tennessee.....	132,480
June 3, 1856	Mobile and Girard.....	840,880
Do.....	Alabama and Chattanooga.....	897,920
Apr. 10, 1869	South and North Alabama.....	576,000
June 3, 1856	Florida Railroad.....	442,542
Mar. 3, 1871	Florida and Alabama.....	165,688
May 17, 1856	Pensacola and Georgia.....	1,568,729
Do.....	Florida, Atlantic and Gulf Central.....	183,153
Do.....	North Louisiana and Texas.....	610,880
June 3, 1856	New Orleans, Opelousas and Great Western.....	967,840
Do.....	St. Louis, Iron Mountain and Southern.....	1,160,667
July 14, 1870	Do.....	1,040,000
Feb. 9, 1853	Memphis and Little Rock.....	438,646
July 28, 1866	Do.....	365,529
May 6, 1870	Little Rock and Fort Smith.....	550,525
Feb. 9, 1853	Do.....	458,771
July 28, 1866	Hannibal and St. Joseph.....	781,944
Apr. 10, 1869	Pacific and Southwest Branch.....	1,161,235
Mar. 8, 1870	St. Louis, Iron Mountain and Southern.....	219,262
June 10, 1852	St. Louis and Iron Mountain.....	182,718
Do.....	Do.....	640,000
Feb. 9, 1853	Burlington and Missouri River.....	948,643
July 28, 1866	Do.....	948,643
May 6, 1870	Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific.....	1,261,181
Feb. 10, 1866	Cedar Rapids and Missouri River.....	1,298,739
May 15, 1856	Iowa Falls and Sioux City.....	1,226,163
June 2, 1864	Dubuque and Sioux City.....
Jan. 31, 1873	Des Moines Valley.....
May 15, 1856	Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul.....	1,536,000
June 3, 1856	McGregor and Missouri River.....	524,800
Do.....	Sioux City and St. Paul.....	312,384
Do.....	Port Huron and Lake Michigan.....	1,052,469
Do.....	Jackson, Lansing and Saginaw.....	568,828
Do.....	Flint and Pere Marquette.....	629,182
Do.....	Grand Rapids and Indiana.....	531,200
June 7, 1864	Marquette, Houghton and Ontario.....	552,515
June 3, 1856	Bay De Noquet and Marquette.....	128,000
Mar. 3, 1865	Chicago and Northwestern.....	564,480
July 5, 1862	Chicago, St. Paul and Minneapolis.....	999,983
June 3, 1856	Do.....	524,714
Do.....	St. Croix and Lake Superior and branch to Bay field.....	318,737
May 5, 1864	Do.....	350,000
Do.....	Do.....	215,000

Date of act.	Name of road.	Acres.
June 3, 1856	Chicago and Northwestern.....	600,000
May 5, 1864	Wisconsin Central.....	750,000
June 3, 1856	Wisconsin Railroad Farm Mortgage Land Co.....	1,248,638
Mar. 3, 1857	St. Paul and Pacific.....	1,475,000
Do.....	Western Railroad.....	2,000,000
Mar. 3, 1871	St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba.....	643,403
Mar. 3, 1873	Minnesota Central.....	1,410,000
Do.....	Winona and St. Paul.....	1,010,000
Do.....	St. Paul and Sioux City.....	920,000
May 5, 1864	Lake Superior and Mississippi.....	735,000
Mar. 3, 1857	Southern Minnesota.....	550,000
July 4, 1866	Southern Minnesota Extension.....	800,000
Do.....	Hastings and Dakota.....	1,520,000
Mar. 3, 1863	Leavenworth, Lawrence and Galveston.....	3,000,000
Do.....	Missouri, Kansas and Texas.....	1,700,100
Do.....	Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe.....	2,350,000
July 23, 1866	St. Joseph and Denver City.....	12,000,000
July 25, 1866	Missouri River, Fort Scott and Gulf.....	6,000,000
July 1, 1862	Union Pacific.....	1,000,100
Do.....	Central Branch Union Pacific.....	8,000,000
Do.....	Kansas Pacific.....	1,100,100
Mar. 3, 1869	Union Pacific, successor to Denver Pacific.....
July 1, 1862	Central Pacific.....
Do.....	Central Pacific, successor to Western Pacific.....
July 2, 1864	Burlington and Missouri River.....	2,441,000
Mar. 3, 1865	Sioux City and Pacific.....	60,000
May 21, 1866	Northern Pacific.....	47,000,000
July 2, 1864	Oregon Branch of Central Pacific.....	3,000,000
Do.....	Oregon and California.....	3,500,000
July 25, 1866	Atlantic and Pacific.....	42,000,000
Do.....	Southern Pacific.....	6,000,000
July 25, 1868	Southern Pacific Branch Line.....	3,520,000
Mar. 3, 1871	Do.....

But this was not all, for in 1862 and 1864 Congress again came to their aid by authorizing to be issued to them United States bonds, in the sum of \$64,623,512, with interest thereon at the rate of 6 per cent, payable by the United States. I also desire to append a statement of this bond issue, from which it will be seen that we have paid a sum equal to the principal in interest. For in 1882, which is the date of the statement I attach, we had paid in interest alone \$39,279,632.91.

Bonds issued to railway companies and interest payable by United States at 6 per cent. Bonds running thirty years.

Name of railway.	Principal outstanding.	Interest paid by the United States.
Central Pacific.....	\$25,885,120	\$21,899,448.07
Kansas Pacific.....	6,303,000	5,751,153.09
Union Pacific.....	27,236,512	23,323,659.69
Central Branch, Union Pacific.....	1,600,000	1,433,808.26
Western Pacific.....	1,970,560	1,550,015.34
Sioux City and Pacific.....	1,628,320	1,396,508.29
Total.....	64,623,512	55,344,682.74

I am aware of the fact that in the past few years some of this money has been collected from these companies and some of it has been secured, but not all of it by any means. And everyone at all familiar with the transaction knows what desperate efforts were made by these companies to defeat collections wherever attempted. There are still other advantages which these railways enjoy by permission of Congress. We are paying them annually for transporting or carrying the mails \$34,000,000, and in addition to this sum about \$5,000,000 per annum for rent of postal cars. We are paying 8 cents a pound, or \$8 a hundred, for the transportation of our mail for an average distance of not over 442 miles; this is more than 50 per cent higher than the rate charged for any other kind of freight, and more than 50 per cent higher than the rate charged by any express company.

While the rent paid on these postal cars sometimes reaches as high as \$20,000 per annum for a single car, and the cars would not cost exceeding \$17,000 to build and equip them, we are paying \$3,000 more each year by way of rent than the cars cost. Would it not be economy to at least own these cars? Or does any sane man believe that any private individual or other corporation outside of the railroads could get this kind of contract with the Government? Or does he believe that anyone ought to have such a contract? Not satisfied with this, Congress has been year after year granting these same companies a subsidy or bonus of \$195,000, under pretext of getting them to carry a fast mail. This is, in my judgment, even more vicious than the ship subsidy, for there is less excuse for it. What reason can there be for paying this bonus to roads carrying mail from New York City to Washington, and then from here on to the South? Investigation of the matter fails to disclose that any extra trains are being run, or that any better time is being made with it than would be made without it. Then, what valid reason can be assigned for continuing

this useless and extravagant expenditure? For myself I am glad of the fact that I have never voted for it, nor do I ever expect to do so. We hear considerable talk of reducing postage to 1 penny, and such we ought to have and could have were it not for the exorbitant charges made by these companies for transporting the mail.

There is yet one other matter relating to these corporations of far more concern and still greater importance to the welfare of our people than any of these things of which I have been speaking, and that is their utter and total disregard of the interstate-commerce act passed by Congress in 1887. Under this act a commission was appointed, charged with the high and responsible duty of determining the reasonableness of traffic rates, and preventing discriminations and undue preferences in freight rates. That this body has the power by proper legislation to control and correct these outrages and abuses no one will deny, and yet the fact remains, open and notorious, that it has never been done, for when the courts had construed this act of 1887 it was found to be so very defective in their judgment that the Interstate Commerce Commission had but very little authority to make any orders affecting railroads and no authority to enforce such orders as they did make. This Commission has reported annually to Congress, pointing out these decisions and defects of the law, and asking to be clothed with authority to make the Commission effective, instead of a farce; but for some unexplained reason it has never been done.

This law should either be amended and then enforced, or the Commission should be abolished and the miserable pretense stopped. The last report of this Commission, sent to Congress on the 23d day of January last, is both interesting and instructive. They very clearly and forcibly call attention to the fact that the public demands protection under the law from these grasping corporations, especially so since great combinations have been formed and are now being formed to suppress and prevent railway competition, and then they add that "it is possible, however, that the same causes which have prevented serious consideration of this subject by Congress in the past may continue to operate in the future." These influences, it may be inferred, are those of the railroads over the Senate and Congress of the United States. The State legislatures of many States, together with boards of trade and industrial commissions from nearly every city in the country, have passed resolutions asking and begging Congress to speedily amend the act and give them the relief to which they were so justly entitled, and as yet their petitions remain unheeded.

Every member of this House who has read that report has official knowledge of the fact that these corporations are every year giving hundreds of thousands of dollars by way of rebates in freight charges to certain favored shippers. These unlawful advantages enable a few packing houses to suppress competition; it enables a few grain dealers to drive all competitors from the grain market, leaving the helpless producer to sell his products not only in the open markets of the world, but one where there is practically but one purchaser, and where he finds himself absolutely at the mercy of the most grinding monopoly and trust that has ever existed. I am not calling your attention to what may happen in the future, but to a condition of affairs that is now materializing and stands out to confront us, and which demands at our hands prompt and determined action.

For last year the net earnings of the railways of the United States as reported by them amounted to the sum of \$620,279,168, and I have no doubt but what the sum was much larger. The value of the wheat and cotton crops of the United States for 1900 was: Wheat, \$323,516,177, and cotton \$334,847,868. Thus it will be seen that the net earnings of these corporations for one year will equal the total value of two of the largest and most valuable products raised in the United States.

If the honest and toiling producer must thus continue, year after year, to surrender the results of his labors to these vultures of transportation, when may we reasonably expect to look for the betterment of his condition? Never.

Even in this time of boasted Republican prosperity and plenty there are hundreds of thousands of daily laborers who can not stand ten days of suspension from work without suffering for bread. And there are thousands and hundreds of thousands of farmers who can not stand the partial failure of one crop without being forced to appeal to the public for aid to support themselves and families. This very condition of affairs exists in my own State to-day, where one season's drought has reduced to absolute penury and want a people who are as honest, as industrious, and as brave as ever graced the citizenship of any State in this Union.

While this condition exists, still we have a certain measure of prosperity. The railways and trust monopolies and a few like corporations are enjoying greater profits than in any other period of their existence.

There is one more fact to which I desire to call attention before

I conclude, and that is the condition existing here in the city of Washington. Two years ago the Commissioners of the District of Columbia reported to this House, in response to a resolution, that certain railways entering the city had been authorized by act of Congress to take possession of and occupy certain lands belonging to the Government worth several hundred thousand dollars. They did not purchase them, they pay no rent, and pay no taxes, and yet they occupy them by the will of Congress. When we contemplate these things, it is no longer a question as to the governmental ownership of railways, but the question is, How much longer shall the railroads continue to own the Government?

When these consolidations and combinations shall be perfected, as they will be in a short time, and by this means put an end to competing railways, they will then turn their attention—and I feel sure they are already doing so—to the task of preventing the improvement of the rivers of the country, and the fight against river appropriations will be strong and earnest, for with this accomplished there will be an end to railway competition from all sources, and they will be left in absolute control. Just how long these parasites are to be permitted to feed upon the public at the will and by the consent of Congress is a question that should demand an immediate answer. [Loud applause.]

Mr. BURKETT. Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House for consideration consists of two parts, or rather pertains to two distinct things, in connection with the rural free-delivery service. The first one of these I favor; the second one I feel that I must oppose. The first part of the bill, if passed, will make the rural free delivery a permanent thing. The latter part of the bill provides for letting the carrying or distributing of mail under the contract system.

I shall be very brief in giving my reasons for my position on each of these questions. It was well, perhaps, when rural free delivery was inaugurated that it should have been upon a temporary plan, for it was to us, in fact, an experiment. There were many things and many conditions to experiment with before Congress was justified in creating it in full form as one of the permanent parts of the Governmental service. Congress did not then know the people would receive it—whether or not it could be made of advantage to the people. Congress could not tell whether the end would justify the means, whether the cost would be sustained by the judgment of the people. It was a new venture, an untried experiment. It was a bold undertaking, and I say it was well, perhaps, that such definite action should not be taken that might not be easily undone if the service should prove inexpedient and undesirable.

But, sirs, those conditions do not pertain to-day. It is no longer, in fact, an experiment, and in my judgment should not be so in law. The people have received it gladly; they have hailed its coming with applause. They have become attached to it, and we must not take it from them. Sirs, if one of the two must be discontinued, then, in my judgment, better had we discontinue city delivery than rural delivery. But neither will ever be taken from the people, for they are a service that belongs to the people, and it is a proper function of the Government to furnish them.

In the district which I have the honor to represent there are now more than 3,000 families who receive their mail daily by this service. On the 20th day of February, 1902, I took occasion to write each of them and ask their opinion of the service, whether or not it should be continued. I have had more than 2,000 answers up to this time. I wish I could read them to the House. I wish I might impress you as those letters impressed me of the anxious solicitude for its perpetuity with which the patrons watch our actions here to-day.

Out of 2,000 letters less than 20 criticised the system, and each of those writers live in the vicinity of small post-offices that have been discontinued by the rural service. Those letters are full of reasons for the continuance of the service. For the first time the farmer has been able to take a daily paper and keep abreast with the affairs of the world. Markets are known daily. One man said that 10 miles from his post-office he read a paper daily at the noon hour. More than 500 of those letters testified to the fact that it took away the isolation of farm life and brought the farmer in closer contact with the world and its doings. All this tends to make better men and women, brighter boys and girls, and better citizens.

In short, the system is a good educator. It furnishes opportunities for improvement, intellectually and morally, that should be considered as one of the strongest elements in argument for its continuance. Several said that it had increased the value of their farms from two to ten dollars per acre. Many have written me that they would rather pay for the service than have it discontinued. One wrote that he would be willing to pay a hundred dollars per year rather than lose the service. Many suggested a readiness to pay twenty-five to fifty dollars rather than be deprived of its benefits.

Then, too, it is an economical service. It is better that one man should deliver mail to a hundred families every day, than that twenty men per day, on an average, should make a trip to town for their mail. Let us pass this part of the bill and make rural free delivery an assured fact, requiring specific legislation to discontinue it. As it is now, as has already been developed, the whole thing may be stopped by the raising of a point of order to the appropriation bill. The predicament is too perilous—it merits more substantial moorings.

The part of the bill which I object to is as follows:

Hereafter all mail service on rural free-delivery mail routes shall be performed by carriers designated pursuant to an advertisement inviting competitive bidding.

In opposing this second part of the bill I desire first to pay my tribute of appreciation to the committee for the tireless effort they have given to the subject. I have no doubt but they have had the good of the service at heart when they brought in the contract system. But is this a proper service to be contracted? It comes in direct touch with the people—with the individuals served. There is more to be considered than cheapness when such a service is at stake.

Suppose a swearing, swaggering, careless man should be the lowest bidder. He would put the entire service in disrespect. I rather like the idea of keeping the carrier in the closest possible relationship to the patrons. I wish he might be their choice, and responsible to them in a measure for his selection, and they in turn responsible for him. This is peculiarly a people's service. They take pride in it. They look after it. They improve the roads and altogether do much to make the service expeditious.

I desire to read an extract from a letter that I received just this morning from a patron of one of the routes of my district. This man in his letter urges the continuance of the service and suggests some possible improvements, but the part I desire to call special attention to is as follows:

The salary of the carrier is a little too small, especially this year, when grain is so high. But we have done what we could to help him along. About six weeks ago I hitched onto my wagon and went out among the patrons of the route. I did not go very far before I had on 25 bushels of corn and 5 bushels of oats, worth about \$17, which we made him a present of. I think the salary ought to be about \$600 per year at least.

Another gentleman on another route writes me that the patrons have arranged to pay for the carrier's horse feed and dinner. Others write of other little courtesies extended. One carrier wrote me that during a very cold snap hot coffee was served him every day at a particular house on his route. This all goes to show the personal interest that these patrons have in the route and the kindly feeling for their carrier. In most instances they have selected these carriers. He has been their choice. Then, too, it shows that the carrier has not been paid as these patrons believe he should be paid. In most of the letters that I have received there has been the opinion expressed that the salary should be \$600. I speak of this merely to vindicate the action of the House heretofore had, of adding an amount sufficient for such increase of salary to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill.

Let us have this service as it is. If perchance the Postmaster-General should desire to experiment with a few routes under a contract system I have no particular objections. At the end of a year he can tell us more about it. But, sirs, I am opposed at this time to making this leap in the dark. The contract system is not a favorite with the people in other particulars and other services. In my judgment it would be a failure in this service. Let us strike from the bill that part providing for the contract system and pass that part which continues for all time the system of rural free delivery.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Chairman, at this late hour, the last day of general debate, after a week of fatiguing attendance and close attention to the arguments that have been made on both sides of this bill, it would be not only injudicious as a friend of the bill, but cruel to the faithful members of this House who have remained patiently until this time, were I to impose upon them any lengthy speech upon this subject. I have got past that embryonic stage, which every member has to pass through, of desiring to speak for the RECORD.

I believe that had the membership of the House remained, or had I had an opportunity earlier in the day when more were here, I might have presented to this committee some phases of this subject that have not been touched upon, or, if touched upon, but lightly. But recognizing that nearly all who are here have committed themselves by their remarks upon this bill, upon the one side or the other, I feel that it would be, perhaps, a useless waste of your time and of mine were I to go into an extended argument in behalf of the bill.

I will say in a general way that the twelve members of the Post-Office Committee who signed this report have listened candidly, conscientiously, and faithfully to the arguments that have been urged against it, and that not a single one of those twelve

members has seen or heard any reason for changing the views which actuated him in preparing and reporting this bill.

During the course of the debate under the five-minute rule I expect to present some of the phases of this question to which I refer, but at this time, Mr. Chairman, I think I shall merely ask the same indulgence that has been given to other members, to print the remainder of my remarks in the RECORD; and I invite not only those who are present, but such of our colleagues as may be absent, whose usual Sunday morning duty, before they go to church and after eating breakfast and reading the Washington Post, is to wade carefully through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to find out what condition of affairs the country is in—I invite you and invite them to read the argument which I would have presented earlier in the day and which will be printed therein. And I feel satisfied that when the debate opens on Monday under the five-minute rule the opponents of this bill, having thus the benefit of my wisdom, will cheerfully consent to withdraw their opposition and pass the bill unanimously. [Laughter.]

As a member of the Post-Office Committee, which reported this bill, I have followed the debate during the week that it has been in progress for the purpose of ascertaining if there was any real good, sound, or logical reason that could be urged against its provisions. I am frank to say that I have heard nothing to change the views which I entertained a week ago. I have heard appeals to prejudice; statements based upon ignorance of existing conditions, the present law and practice of the Post-Office Department, and the provisions of the bill itself.

I have heard frantic appeals to save the rural free-delivery service from destruction, and have listened with some surprise to the attempts of some of the members to create antagonism on the part of those representing what may be called rural districts to the postal service as it exists in cities. But if any one good reason has been stated why the plan proposed in the bill of letting this service out by contract is not the best I have failed to hear it in this Hall or to read it in the RECORD.

No member on this floor is probably less personally interested than I am as to which method is adopted of performing this service. I have two of these routes now in operation and two more applied for; possibly six routes in all would cover my entire district. I am frank to say that for the first two or three years of the experimental stage of this rural free-delivery service I was skeptical as to its advantages and the possibility of its successful extension throughout the country, but I finally recognized that it had come to stay, that it was to be one of the leading features of the postal service, and recognizing that positive legislation would be required to put it upon a footing where the appropriations devoted to that purpose could originate in the House without being subject to a point of order, I, in common with the other members of the committee, have given to the subject my careful consideration, and have endeavored to present the results of our study and judgment in this and the appropriation bill which is to follow.

I might add also that I have no complaint against any of the officials connected with this service, as I named the two carriers for the routes already established in my district, and, in the way of official patronage in the Department, have one clerk now being carried on the roll.

Recognizing the right of any of my constituents to write to me in regard to anything of a public nature in which they may be interested, I have not found fault with any employee in the postal service who has solicited my influence or vote in behalf of any measure before this House, and it was with some doubt as to the propriety of such action that I read the order prohibiting the employees of the Post-Office Department from writing to their members, or for that matter making personal calls upon them, in behalf of any legislation. I have always made it a point to acknowledge the receipt of such letters, answer them as fully as possible, and, if prepared to do so, to state frankly my position upon the subject-matter of their communications.

But while I recognize this right on the part of the employees of the Government to correspond directly with the members of this Congress, I look upon it as a very different matter, and one which might well call for prompt and strict action on the part of the Executive, when the force of a bureau of any department of the Government shall devote its attention to a systematic attempt to influence legislation; and that, I believe, has been the case of certain employees of the Rural Free-Delivery Bureau of the Post-Office Department in connection with this bill.

Inspired editorials, interviews, and articles in the papers of this city and of other cities in the country bear the earmarks of production in this Bureau. While I admit I have no positive knowledge on the subject, the very report of the minority on this bill was, I am satisfied, prepared and furnished to the gentleman from Virginia who signed it by an official in the Post-Office Department, and I challenge the gentleman to deny that statement.

The rural free-delivery service is fortunate or unfortunate in

having in the office of the superintendent in this city a gentleman of whom the head of the Bureau said, in hearings before the committee: "I consider him a very valuable man in many ways. No; not in a clerical way. I would say that his forte was not in clerical duties. Mr. Clarke's forte is in considering matters that come up for which we have no precedent—writing rulings and petitions and reports, at which he is very apt." The superintendent might have added, no doubt, that he was also very valuable in running a literary branch of the Bureau, furnishing newspaper articles, and generally bringing pressure to bear upon the members of the House to defeat bills which are not in accordance with the views and wishes of the head of the office.

When the committee came to take up the question of providing for the rural free-delivery carrier service, our first thought was naturally to continue the existing system of appointment, and no thought of a contract service occurred to any of us until later. We had been receiving letters almost equivalent to demands for increase of compensation for the carriers already in the service. A so-called national association of rural free-delivery carriers, with headquarters in Chicago, had fixed the amount at \$850. Other demands were even higher. The First Assistant Postmaster-General, in his last report, page 42, says:

The complaints of insufficiency of pay have received careful consideration. There is every desire to raise the character of the service and to adequately compensate the rural carriers, but one of the chief difficulties encountered in arriving at a uniform adjustment has arisen from the varying conditions prevailing in different sections of the country. In some States, where horses are cheap and forage abundant, \$500 a year for a service which occupies only a part of a day is regarded as good pay, and there is almost a scramble among farmers' sons for the appointment.

On the other hand, in New England and the extreme Western States, where forage is scarce and dear, a man who owns a horse can command higher wages than a rural carrier receives, especially during the summer months, and he is accordingly disinclined to enter the rural service at the rate of pay prescribed. It is not deemed desirable to establish a graduated scale of salaries at the present time, except upon the general rule which has been heretofore approximately followed of allowing \$100 a year for each 5 miles of route. Nevertheless, the hardships presented by individual cases have not failed to command attention, and it is the earnest wish of this office to adopt some plan which will afford relief, without making discriminations calculated to promote jealousies between States and sections or to justify a charge of unfair preference.

This statement of the First Assistant clearly sets forth the difficulty which surrounds the attempt to establish anything like a uniform system of salaries for this carrier service. As he very justly says, a salary which would be ample in one locality is insufficient in another, and the many differences of climate, roads, sparseness or density of population, and grade of intelligence in the community in which these routes run, present natural difficulties of adjustment for anything like a fair and equitable basis for a uniform salary.

Your committee recognizing these difficulties presented by the First Assistant, first considered and discussed the possibility of fixing the compensation by a graded scale dependent upon the length of the route and possibly the number of people served. But this did not meet the difficulty, and was abandoned by the committee.

While this matter was still unsettled the attention of the committee was directed to the report of the Second Assistant, and particularly to that part relating to the improvements which had been made in the star-route service. In the statement made by General Shallenberger before the committee, during the hearing for the preparation of the post-office appropriation bill, it was shown that the objectionable features which existed in the old star-route service, and which at one time made that service a stench in the nostrils of the decent people of the country and culminated in the Brady frauds, had been entirely eliminated in the lettings made in the last two years.

This caused the committee to consider the possibility of establishing a similar contract service for the rural free-delivery carriers, and the plan seemed so feasible, by reason of the fact that the contractors under the star-route service are now required, under the new lettings, to do a service that approximates closely to the rural free-delivery service, and which could without very much difficulty be made identical with it; and the more the committee considered the matter the more firmly it became convinced that the contract system was the proper solution of the question of compensation for the rural free mail carriers. I shall touch upon the changes in the star-route service to which I referred a little more fully further on.

I have stated one of the reasons, drawn from the difficulty of adjustment of salaries referred to by the First Assistant, as the leading one which actuated the committee to seek for a method of avoiding these difficulties. But there was another reason, perhaps of less importance, but strong enough to claim the attention of the committee, in the danger which might lie behind the building up of an organized force which will ultimately number from 40,000 to 50,000 of these carriers into a semipolitical machine with power and the probable inclination to make demands for unreasonable increases of salary, and to exercise coercion to compel obedience to these demands.

I know that gentlemen in the course of this debate have boasted that they would be independent of this pressure; have belittled the danger of this organization; have pointed to the civil-service rules under which these carriers have been placed as a restraint upon any action that they might be tempted to take; have said that members of the committee were creating a phantom danger which would never develop.

But this danger is not a fanciful one. It is an actual danger which exists to-day and which is strong enough to influence many members in their stand upon this bill. There are few, if any, members probably on the floor of this House who have not, in connection with this bill, felt its influence directly or indirectly. One of the leading members of this House, sturdy and independent, during the progress of this debate informed me that four weeks ago he was for the bill; but since that time he had heard from his rural carriers and their friends and would have to vote against it.

If this unorganized force of only about 7,000 carriers can thus influence men of high standing in this House, what will that influence amount to when, instead of 7,000, it will amount to 50,000, united into a great national association and demanding salaries the equal of those paid the carrier service in the cities and in addition to that the cost of maintaining horses and wagons? The expense of this service will be of no concern to the member if he is threatened with the danger of being held up and coerced by these carriers and their friends.

Nor will it do to belittle the influence which these carriers can exert. Over the 25 miles, more or less, of their routes as they drive with this mail six days of every week they will, in the course of a year, become acquainted, probably, with every patron on the route. They will be the purveyors of news and gossip. They will, if accommodating, perform friendly services and do accommodating errands for those to whom they deliver the mail. They will be the distributors of political gossip.

Being under the service of the Government, wearing a uniform, driving a specially designed conveyance, they will be looked up to and their opinions and statements given undue importance, and thus a designing carrier can make use of his position, quietly and insidiously, and without making himself liable to punishment for violation of civil-service rules, to reward the friends who will vote to increase his salary and punish a conscientious member who will not yield to his unreasonable demands.

Personally I have no fear of such a condition in the district which I represent, as the number of carriers will never become sufficiently great to exercise any political influence. But in other districts, made up of strictly rural communities, in which the number of routes may run up into the hundreds, the committee has felt that they will become a potent factor in controlling the political situation.

As I have said before, the so-called national association demands \$850 as the maximum salary. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] did not hesitate to announce the opinion that it should be \$1,100; and if this bill is defeated, I have no doubt whatever that we shall find members on this floor in the next Congress demanding a graded scale of salaries equal to those of a city carrier.

I have had some experience with wages in country districts. As a boy, during and immediately after the close of the civil war, I lived in southern Indiana on a farm. I taught a winter school for three months for \$100, and out of that had to pay my board. And this was the highest salary that was paid in any of the schools in the vicinity. I worked for three years with a thrashing machine for \$1.50 a day from daylight to dark through the long summer day, and I clerked in a country store at \$20 a month and my board, and the cost of living then was greater than it is now. I was glad to get the work at the wages I have named, and I should have thought that I was on the high road to wealth and a place among the captains of industry if I could have had a rural-carrier route and steady employment the year round at \$500 a year.

Let me illustrate further: I happen to have the good fortune to own one of the best farms in Hamilton County, in the vicinity of Cincinnati, which I let out to a tenant on shares, the arrangement being the universal one in that locality, as follows: He furnishes all the seed, does all the work, and gives me half of everything that is raised. He is compelled to keep four horses, to hire two men during the plowing and seeding time and for gathering the crops, whose wages he pays out of his share of the profits.

The total income of the farm is about \$1,600, of which he gets half, about \$800. Out of this \$800 must come all of the expenses I have referred to above, and his net income in no year probably exceeds \$250 or \$300 a year. Along the pike in front of this farm a rural carrier drives, and working four or five hours a day earns a salary, with little or no laborious work, double or thrice what this man and his hard-working wife can make out of the farm in the course of a year. The farmer takes the chances of loss of crops by drought or insect pests; the carrier takes no risk whatever. The farmer runs the risk of depressed markets and low

prices, the carrier gets his salary by check on the first of each month whether prices are up or prices are down.

The country school-teacher in most communities is well paid if he can get \$500 a year. The country preacher gets even less. The country merchant feels well satisfied if his books show a balance on the right side at the end of the year of an equal amount.

Knowing these facts as I do, I have little patience with the buncombe of the gentlemen who in this debate have made the Hall resound with their inquiry of why should the country carrier not be paid as much as a carrier in the city.

They might as well ask why, because a square foot of ground in a city will sell for \$100, a square foot of ground in the country should not bring the same price. They seem to forget that while an acre of farm land may be worth \$100, that same acre, if in the midst of a great city, might be worth a million dollars; that a man can board at a country hotel at a dollar a day who will have to pay four times as much in a city hostelry. A carrier in the city is paid the equivalent of wages for similar service in other lines of employment. A clerk in a store gets from \$800 to \$1,200 a year in the city; in the country he would get from \$300 to \$500. The difference in the cost of living is of itself a sufficient answer to the question.

Among the other questions that have been asked and reiterated is, "If the contract system is a good one for the country carrier, why is it not also advisable to put the city carrier under contract?" The answer is simple and has been repeated many times by the friends of the bill in this debate. There are two sufficient reasons. First, the service on the rural route is one which can not be limited to the same number of hours on all the various routes in different sections of the country. The number of persons served is different.

Where the roads are hilly the time must necessarily be slower than on level roads; where the country is sparsely settled the number of boxes at which the carrier would have to stop is less than where the country is thickly settled; in winter time routes in the Northern States will be covered with snow, and in some cases become almost if not quite impassable. The city carrier, on the other hand, whether he be in New York or San Francisco, in Chicago or New Orleans, is required to work eight hours a day, no more, no less. The number of patrons of a route is practically the same in these various cities, and the varying conditions of the seasons make little difference in his ability to perform the service. A salaried service, therefore, for the city carrier is the best and most equitable arrangement.

Another reason why it would be impossible and impracticable to let the city carrier service out by contract would arise from the fact that, whereas there would be only two or three bidders on a country route, if the city carrier's route were let out by contract there would be many more bidders than that for the service and a great part of the time of the Department would be consumed in opening bids and awarding contracts.

In addition to that, it would be impossible to transfer a city carrier from one route to another, a thing which would never become necessary in the country carrier service. In short, the mere fact that it would be impracticable to put the city carrier service under contract is no argument whatever against the contract service in the rural delivery, because the conditions are so entirely different between the two classes of the service.

Some of the gentlemen opposed to the bill have laid great stress upon the fact that the present carriers are men of high character, trustworthy, and reliable, while those which would be appointed under the contract system might be disreputable, unaccommodating and disrespectful. One gentleman—and perhaps more—in the course of the debate stated that while the farmer is out on his farm tending to his work his family at the farmhouse might be liable to insult and abuse from disreputable contract carriers.

These gentlemen evidently forget that it is no part of this service to deliver or collect mail at the houses of the patrons. They are not supposed to leave their wagon, as the rule of the Department requires that the boxes shall be so placed as to be accessible without alighting, and a similar regulation would apply and be enforced if the carrier performed the service under contract. There is no personal delivery or collection of mail contemplated by either system. It is a delivery to a box or a collection from a box, and the family of the farmer stands in no more danger of improper action on the part of the carrier under either system than they would from an ordinary traveler along the road.

One might infer from the remarks of some of the gentlemen in this debate that the farmer had no interest in or benefit from the city delivery service. Hardly any post-office appropriation bill comes up for consideration in the House but some member will declaim against the number of deliveries and salaries paid to the carriers in the city.

While it is true that a large portion of the city carrier service is devoted to the carrying of local mail within the city limits, it must be remembered that it is this very local mail, most of which is first class, that pays the bulk of revenue into the Post-Office De-

partment, and without which the rates of postage to the farmer, as well as to the resident of the city, would have to be increased or the money taken out of the Treasury to supply a deficit; and the farmer must not forget that the money that thus comes from the Treasury for the Post-Office deficiency is raised by taxation in some form and falls either directly or indirectly upon his shoulders.

It must also be remembered that the farmer himself, when he writes a letter and sends it to the city, may be very much interested in securing its prompt delivery and speedy reply. He may have broken his reaper, mower, or thrasher and be sending to the manufacturer for castings to repair the break. The delay of a few hours in the delivery of his letter and the filling of his order might result in the loss of a considerable portion of his crop. He may be writing to a commission merchant for prices in a rapidly changing market, and the delay of a few hours in reply might lose him hundreds of dollars.

The post-office system of the country is not a heterogeneous group of rival or antagonistic parts. It is one great homogeneous whole. It is like the human body, with its various organs and parts, each adapted to its special function, but all required to make a perfect whole. The old story of the disagreement of the various parts of the body and the refusal of one to perform its proper function is typical of what would happen to the great postal service of the country if any one of its great branches should become inefficient, and therefore it is that with every improvement in the city carrier service the rural service which joins onto it and connects the farmer directly with his correspondents in the city is also improved. There should be no feeling of rivalry or antagonism in these two arms of the service. The gentlemen representing rural districts in which there is no city carrier service should be as eager to develop and improve the latter as the representative of a city district should be to benefit the rural free delivery.

The great danger to the rural free-delivery service which the committee apprehends is that it will become so expensive that it will ultimately break itself down unless placed upon a contract basis, and this view should appeal most strongly to those members who represent districts which are sparsely settled, for if the Department should cease to extend the service or should curtail any of the service already started by reason of the insufficiency of the appropriation, those districts would naturally suffer first.

The committee have felt that it would be better to have 50,000 routes on which the compensation for carriers was fair and reasonable than to have 30,000 routes on which the carriers were paid 50 per cent or more in excess of the current rate of wages or salary for equally difficult work. In other words, it is better to have many routes at fair salaries than to have a few routes at excessive salaries. It is better to have the whole territory of the United States served by a contract system, which will keep the compensation within reasonable limits, than to have a limited portion of the country only served with a high-priced salary service.

I do not wish to be misunderstood is the use of the phrase "high-priced salary." The question as to what a high salary is is a comparative one. A salary may be high in one section which would be low in another. Six hundred dollars is not an exorbitant salary in any section of the country, especially if the cost of maintaining a horse and wagon is to come out of that. But \$850, \$1,000, and \$1,100, as suggested by the gentleman from Indiana, is far beyond what the service is actually worth in probably any considerable portion of the country.

By the contract system the carrier's compensation would be fixed by his own bid. If he is willing to bid for a route on the basis of \$500 he would, no doubt, be glad to get it for that. Other work of the Government is done by bidding, and no complaint is made. We never make a great river or harbor improvement or construct a public building but what it is done by contract on bids and awards. I know it is claimed that this is a special personal service and that certain qualifications are demanded of the carrier which could not be obtained under contract system.

This, I am sure, would not apply to contracts let in accordance with the provisions of this bill, for the committee have been careful to provide the same requirements as to character and qualification as are now provided in the rules controlling appointments by the Bureau. If any gentleman will take the trouble to make a comparison between the bill and those rules he will see that to all intents and purposes the qualifications of those who would bid for a contract, if the bill should become a law, would be the same as those now required since the 1st of February, 1902, for carriers appointed on new routes. This I will not elaborate, as it has been gone over very thoroughly by other gentlemen.

The statement has been repeatedly made that the improvement of the rural free-delivery service by increasing the revenue from the sale of stamps and the discontinuance of star routes and fourth-class offices will ultimately make the service self-supporting. This I can hardly agree to. I doubt whether it ever will be self-supporting, and I feel very certain that the discontinuance of star routes and fourth-class offices will go but a very little way toward paying the expense of extending the rural free service.

By reference to the report of the First Assistant for the present year (p. 53) it is shown that the total amounts saved in the star-route service superseded by rural free delivery within the twelve months previous amounted to \$173,404.41, and that the saving by the discontinuance of fourth-class offices by reason of the establishment of the rural free service in the same time was \$120,221.43, making a total from these two sources of considerably less than \$300,000—a very small item compared with the cost during the same time of extending the rural service.

I might add also that even that amount is considerably in excess of what is actually paid, as the discontinuance of fourth-class offices only results in throwing the business, which before went to them, largely into the office which is the terminus of the route.

I am sure that much of the opposition to this bill, both in Congress and out of it, grows out of ignorance of the present star-route service with which the contract service in this bill has been more or less compared. Under the old star-route service in Brady's time, one person or corporation could put in bids for hundreds or thousands of the star routes and, if the lowest bidders, would be awarded the contracts for all these various routes. They would then proceed to sublet or farm out these contracts, having no regard for the character of the subcontractor, his equipment, or anything else, except that he was to relieve the head contractor of the actual carriage of the mail.

Neither the contractor nor the subcontractor was required to live on the line of his route. Frequently the bids were for less than the service could be performed for, and extra allowances were made to compensate for slight additions to the routes. Not only were great frauds practiced on the Government through this system, but the service became disgraceful and contemptible in the eyes of the people.

I say frankly that the committee would never have recommended such a system in connection with the rural free-delivery service. But the star-route service of to-day is a very different thing. The following are the regulations inserted in the advertisement for bids for star-route service, as found in the report of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General for this year (p. 5):

LOCAL BIDDERS.

Under this advertisement no bid will be considered unless the bidder shall agree in his proposal that in the event of the service being awarded to him he will give his personal supervision to the performance of the same and will reside on or contiguous to the route.

BOX DELIVERY ON STAR ROUTES.

It is contemplated that the new contract shall make provision for delivering mail into boxes along nearly all of the routes. The terms of the advertisement on this subject are as follows:

In addition to carrying the mails to the various post-offices on the star routes covered by this advertisement the carrier on each route, except where otherwise specifically stated, will be also required to deliver mail into all boxes and hang small bags or satchels containing mail on cranes or posts that may be erected along the route under the following conditions:

Any person living on or near any star route herein described, and not within the corporate limits of any town or within 80 rods of any post-office, who desires his mail deposited at a given point on the line of the route by the carrier on said route may provide and erect a suitable box or crane on the roadside, located in such manner as to be reached as conveniently as practicable by the carrier without dismounting from the vehicle or horse, and such person shall file with the postmaster at the post-office to which his mail is addressed (which shall be one of the two post-offices on the route on either side of and next to the box or crane) a request in writing for the delivery of his mail to the carrier on the route for deposit at the designated point, at the risk of the addressee. The small bag or satchel above described, as well as the box or crane, must be provided by the person for whose use it is intended, without expense to the Department.

It shall be the duty of the postmaster at every such post-office, upon a written order from any person living on or near the star route, to deliver to the proper mail carrier for that route any mail matter—placing in the respective satchels, where such are used, the mail for the persons to whom such satchels belong—with instructions as to the proper mail box or crane at which said mail matter shall be deposited; but registered mail shall not be so delivered unless expressly requested by the addressee in his written order. No mail matter so delivered to a carrier shall be carried past another post-office on the route before being deposited into a mail box or hung on a crane or post.

The carrier on the star route will be required to receive from any postmaster on the route any mail matter or private mail satchel that may be intrusted to him, outside of the usual mail bag, and shall carry such mail matter or private mail satchel to and deposit it into the proper mail box or hang it on the proper mail crane placed on the line of the route for this purpose; such service by the carrier to be without charge to the addressees.

The mail carriers must be of good character and of sufficient intelligence to properly handle and deposit the mail along the routes.

The Department does not prescribe any particular design of box or satchel to be used for this service, but the person providing either should see that it is of such character as to afford ample protection to his mail. If there is a lock attached to the box, a key is not to be held by the carrier, as he is expected to deposit the mail without the necessity of unlocking the box. [The box or crane should be so located on the roadside that the carrier can deposit the mail without leaving his vehicle or horse, and yet not where it will obstruct public travel.]

The carrier is not required to collect mail from the boxes, but there is no objection to his doing so if it does not interfere with his making the schedule time. The law provides that every carrier of the mail shall receive any mail matter presented to him if properly prepaid by stamps, and deliver the same for mailing at the next post-office at which he arrives, but that no fees shall be allowed him therefor.

Delivery of mail by star-route carriers will not be permitted over such portions of star routes as may have in operation the rural free-delivery service, except as an additional or supplemental service when shown to be necessary and practicable.

The depositing of mail along the line of the route will not be required of carriers on steamboat routes.

This new service has been successfully inaugurated in the first contract section, and contracts containing these regulations have been made to run until June 30, 1905. Contracts are now being let in the second section in a similar manner. Your committee felt that if this star-route service, as improved by these new rules and regulations, could be successfully conducted, there was no reason why a service somewhat similar, by contract, should not be tried on the rural free-delivery routes.

It is a mere matter of detail, which the Department can work out without difficulty. There is no occasion for any jealousy between the offices of the First Assistant Postmaster-General and the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, if any does exist, nor need there be any fear if the transfer of the rural free-delivery service from the First Assistant, where it now belongs, to the Second Assistant, who has charge of the star-route service. The First Assistant will be authorized to make contracts for this service and the Second Assistant can still continue to make his contracts for the star-route service.

As opportunity will be given under the debate when the bill is considered for amendment to discuss the details of many of the propositions which I have merely and in a most general way hinted at above, I shall postpone further comment upon them until then.

In conclusion, I wish to say that the committee in submitting this bill to the House for action has been actuated solely with a desire to do that which was best for continuing and extending the rural free delivery.

Whatever differences of opinion we might originally have had upon the feasibility of extending this service throughout the country, we are a unit now in recognizing the fact that it is here and here to stay. We have endeavored to present, in the remarks made by the different members of the committee, the reasons which induced us to prefer the contract system to a system of appointment.

We have no sympathy with the demagogic and buncombe cry of cheap! cheap! as applied to this proposed service. We are anxious to secure good service—the best service that can be secured for a fair remuneration. We feel that we ought to pay every dollar that the service is worth and not one dollar more; that the man who bids upon the contract is the best judge of what he can afford to do it for; that the safeguards thrown around the selection and award of contract by the limitations of this bill are such that an equally good character of men shall secure the service as if appointed in accordance with the present system; that the varying conditions in the country will be met by the variations in the contract prices paid for the service so that each carrier will receive what his services are worth in his locality, whether it be greater or less than the amount which another carrier receives in a different locality and under different conditions. This much we have a right to pay for the service and no more.

I have no sympathy with the feeling of recklessness which seems to control the words and the votes of members of this House in the expenditure of public money extravagantly and uselessly. It is true we have an overflowing Treasury, with millions of surplus stored away, but we must not forget that we have many enterprises entailing vast expenditures which are to make a drain upon that reserve.

The Nicaragua Canal, the ship subsidy, river and harbor improvements, naval appropriation expenses; all of these will make drains upon our wealth that will rapidly deplete the Treasury. While it is true that there is as yet no cloud even upon the horizon to warn us of a gathering storm, this era of prosperity must one day reach its climax and begin to recede. The pendulum which swings up must swing down, and when the time comes of straitened finances, diminished income, depleted Treasury, and financial distrust, then it will be well for the rural free-delivery service if it shall be found to be established upon the basis of economy and rational cost.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11728) to classify the rural free-delivery service and fix the compensation to employees thereof, and had come to no resolution thereon.

And then, on motion of Mr. LOUD (at 4 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communication was taken from the Speaker's table and referred, as follows:

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusions of fact and law in the French

spoliation cases relating to The schooner *Friendship*, Samuel Moulton, master, against The United States—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. POWERS of Maine, from the Committee on the Territories, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11997) granting the Hawaii Ditch Company, Limited, the right of way over public lands in the districts of North and South Kohala, in the island of Hawaii, for the purpose of constructing and maintaining ditches or canals and the necessary reservoirs, dams, and the like, for irrigation and domestic purposes in said districts, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 792); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LOVERING, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3865) to establish light-houses at the mouth of Boston Harbor to mark the entrance to the new Broad Sound Channel, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 793); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MONDELL, from the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9676) appropriating the receipts from the sale and disposal of public lands in certain States and Territories to the construction of irrigation works for the reclamation of arid lands, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 794); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (S. 3026) granting an increase of pension to Marie U. Nordstorm, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURKETT (by request): A bill (H. R. 12306) authorizing the President of the United States to appoint certain persons in the Regular Army and place them upon the retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRICK: A bill (H. R. 12307) to pay all of the license moneys collected within municipal corporation limits in the Territory of Alaska, as provided for by an act of Congress approved March 3, 1899, entitled "An act to define and punish crimes in the district of Alaska and to provide a code of criminal procedure for said district," and any amendment thereto, to the corporation within whose limits they accrued—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 12308) requiring the execution of official bonds by assistant postmasters and other subordinate officers and employees to postmasters, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. PEARRE: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 163) extending the thanks of Congress to Rear-Admiral Winfield Scott Schley—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HUGHES: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 164) construing an act entitled "An act to provide for a permanent Census Office," approved March 7, 1902—to the Select Committee on the Census.

By Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 165) proposing an amendment to the Constitution, relating to direct taxes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEELE: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 37) that there be printed, in pamphlet form, 100,000 copies of the oration delivered by the Hon. John Hay in the Hall of the House of Representatives during the exercises in memory of the late President McKinley on February 27, 1902, 60,000 for the use of the House of Representatives and 40,000 for the use of the Senate—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BURLERSON: A resolution (H. Res. 160) that the Secretary of State be respectfully requested to inform the House of Representatives whether he declined to comply with the request of Rev. Hiram W. Thomas to ask the British Government for passports for the said Rev. Dr. Thomas and his wife to visit South African military camps for the purpose of distributing

funds raised in the United States for the relief of noncombatant prisoners—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PEARRE: Memorial of the general assembly of Maryland, requesting the Senators and Representatives of Maryland in Congress to use their united endeavors to secure by an early day the passage of a joint resolution extending the thanks of Congress to Rear-Admiral Winfield Scott Schley for gallant and distinguished services rendered in the destruction of the Spanish fleet near Santiago, on the 3d day of July, in the year 1898—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BELL: Memorial No. 1 of the Colorado legislature, against reducing tariff on Cuban sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 12309) granting an increase of pension to Marshall Cox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 12310) granting a pension to Daniel S. Conover—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: A bill (H. R. 12311) granting a pension to Francis Dorr Lukens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 12312) granting a pension to Mrs. Susan Walker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNER: A bill (H. R. 12313) granting a pension to Thomas E. McIntire—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 12314) for the relief of the heirs of Edmund H. Chambers—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DE GRAFFENREID: A bill (H. R. 12315) granting an increase of pension to James Todd—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOOCH: A bill (H. R. 12316) granting an increase of pension to Weden O'Neal—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IRWIN: A bill (H. R. 12317) for the relief of John W. Neville—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12318) for the relief of Conrad Brandaberry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12319) for the relief of the heirs of Richard Butler, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JACKSON of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 12320) granting a pension to Mrs. Sarah Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12321) to remove charge of desertion against George N. Wheeler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANDIS: A bill (H. R. 12322) granting a pension to William F. Wilcox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12323) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12324) granting a pension to Cora E. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12325) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Paul—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12326) granting an increase of pension to John Kirkham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12327) granting an increase of pension to Melissa Griffin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12328) to correct the military record of Micajah Powell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12329) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of David A. Lindsay—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12330) for the relief of Elijah Watts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12331) for the relief of James M. Blankenship—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12332) for the relief of Charles Condon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 12333) granting a pension to Fred W. Boyd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12334) granting a pension to Irvin M. Ivey—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 12335) granting an increase of pension to Marian A. Mulligan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 12336) granting an increase of pension to Wallace K. May—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 12337) granting an increase of pension to George W. M. Fuller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12338) granting an increase of pension to Ruth Arnold—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 12339) granting a pension to James Hummell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 12340) for the relief of J. R. Claybrooke—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12341) granting a pension to P. A. Milner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12342) granting an increase of pension to W. A. Dever—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARNER: A bill (H. R. 12343) for the relief of the heirs of Dixon Dameron—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WARNOCK: A bill (H. R. 12344) granting an increase of pension to David J. Courter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 12345) granting a pension to Eliza M. Crisell—to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS: Resolution of American Paper and Pulp Association, New York, favoring the establishment of a permanent Census Bureau—to the Select Committee on the Census.

Also, resolutions of Carpenters and Joiners' Union No. 463, of Philadelphia, Pa., advocating the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Petition of General D. S. Stanley Garrison, Regular and Volunteer Army and Navy Union, Buffalo, N. Y., favoring a clerical corps in the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolution of National Shoe Wholesalers' Association, asking that hides be placed on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of Lucky Thought Lodge, No. 232, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, Middletown, N. Y., in support of Senate bill 1118 and House bill 11060, limiting the meaning of the word "conspiracy," etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BABCOCK: Papers to accompany House bill 9977, granting a pension to Minerva Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTLETT: Petition of T. J. Parker and 45 other citizens of Bibb County, Ga., protesting against contract system of free delivery—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BELL: Resolutions of Engineers' Union No. 1, of Denver; Union No. 63, of Pueblo, and citizens of Victor, Colo., favoring a reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Woodworkers' Union No. 99, Colorado Springs, and petition of citizens of Idaho Springs, Colo., for the passage of laws which will prevent the immigration of persons who can not read—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: Appeal from American Chamber of Commerce, of Manila, P. I., for the enactment of laws permitting immigration of coolies—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the National Shoe Wholesalers' Association of the United States, favoring repeal of the duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of Barbers' Local Union No. 185, of Kansas City, Kans., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Commercial Club of Omaha, Nebr., in relation to the reclamation of the vacant public domain—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. BULL: Resolutions of Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Lodge No. 390, Providence, R. I., for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of Frank P. Merrill and other citizens of Blue Hill, Hancock County, Me., and of Granite Cutters' National Union of Norridgewock, Me., favoring a reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CASSINGHAM: Resolution of Division No. 278, Order of Railroad Conductors, of Dennison, Ohio, advocating the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CONNER: Papers to accompany House bill No. 12313, granting a pension to Thomas E. McIntire—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CORLISS: Resolutions of Granite Cutters' Union, of Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners, Local Branch No. 727, and of the Tobacco Workers' International Union, of Detroit, Mich., favoring a restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of General O. M. Poe Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Detroit, Mich., favoring the construction of war vessels in the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CROMER: Petition of rural free-delivery carriers of Bluffton, Hartford City, Montpelier, Muncie, Winchester, Portland, and Elwood, Ind., favoring the passage of House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of Major Mory Post, No. 244, Grand Army of the Republic, of Anderson, Ind., in favor of an amendment to the pension act of June 27, 1890—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of Indiana Democratic Editorial Association, against any needless barriers being placed upon the circulation of legitimate newspapers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Miss Kate Riley and other clerks of Portland (Ind.) post-office, for the classification of salaries of clerks in first and second class post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of the Eighth Congressional district of Indiana, for an amendment to the National Constitution defining legal marriage to be monogamic—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of Carpenters' Union No. 652, Ellwood, Ind., asking that the desert-land laws be amended—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, resolution of the Commercial Club of Muncie, and Cigar Makers' Union No. 214, of Bluffton, Ind., in relation to extension of trade between United States and Cuba—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of Division No. 11, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Indianapolis, Ind., favoring the anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of Cigar Makers' Union No. 275, of Andersonville; No. 175, of Alexandria; Typographical Union No. 331, of Elwood; Plasterers' Association No. 83, of Muncie, and Local Union No. 50, of Elwood, Ind., favoring an educational qualification for immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of Cigar Makers' Union No. 214, Bluffton, Ind.; Union No. 23, Muncie; Tin Plate Workers' and Glass Workers' unions, of Elwood; Typographical Union No. 284, Anderson, and Daughters of Liberty of Elwood and Muncie, Ind., favoring extension of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of Trades Council of Muncie; Typographical Union of Elwood; Glass Blowers' Union of Albany; Tin Workers' Union No. 7, of Muncie; Federal Labor Union No. 8785, of Bluffton; Barbers' Union of Anderson, and Trades Council of Dunkirk, Ind., favoring the construction of war vessels in the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DRAPER: Resolution of Rensselaer County Liquor Dealers' Association, State of New York, in favor of the passage of House bills 178 and 179, proposing to reduce the tax on whisky—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS: Resolution of Butte Stationary Engineers' Union No. 83, Butte, Mont., protesting against the order of the President denying the right of petition to employees of the Government—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of Garner Leather Works, asking that hides be placed on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Resolution of American Paper and Pulp Association, favoring the establishment of a permanent Census Bureau—to the Select Committee on the Census.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of Retail Merchants' Association of Philadelphia, Pa., in opposition to House bill 9352—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of International Broom Makers' Union, No. 44, Pittsburg, Pa., in relation to the transportation of prison-made goods from one State to another—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Swift Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Allegheny, Pa., for amendment of Constitution to prohibit and punish polygamy and defining legal marriage—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the American Chamber of Commerce of Manila, for the enactment of laws in relation to coolie labor in the Philippines—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, resolution of Abe Patterson Post, No. 88, Grand Army of the Republic, Allegheny, Pa., in opposition to placing General Longstreet on the retired list of the Regular Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, Pa., approving of a House bill for changing the grade in the construction of the Pittsburg, Carnegie and Western Railroad over the

Monongahela River at Pittsburg, Pa.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GOOCH: Petition of citizens of Newport, Ky., for the exclusion of Chinese laborers from the United States—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Granville Moody Post, No. 89, of Bellevue, Ky., and William Nelson Post, No. 1, Newport, Ky., Grand Army of the Republic, advocating the building of war vessels in the navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Queen and Crescent Lodge, No. 112, of Ludlow, Ky.; Carpenters' Union and Tobacco Workers' Union No. 44, of Covington, Ky., favoring the passage of a law which will prevent the immigration of persons who can not read—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Resolution of the Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Massachusetts, for the establishment of a national park at Petersburg, Va.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Resolutions of Cigar Makers' Union No. 69, of Three Rivers, Mich., relative to exclusion of Chinese from the United States—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Local Union No. 160, Amalgamated Wood Workers' International Union, of America, of St. Joseph, and of Cigar Makers' Union No. 69, of Three Rivers, Mich., for further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: Resolutions of Switchmen's Union No. 61, of Jackson, Mich., favoring passage of law for exclusion of Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of George Aprill and other citizens of Michigan, against establishing the contract system for rural free delivery—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. JACKSON of Kansas: Petition of citizens of Pittsburg, Kans., for extension of trade between United States and Cuba—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Parsons Lodge, No. 293, of Parsons, Kans., in favor of the exclusion of Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, paper in the pension case of Sarah Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill to correct the military record of George Wheeler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEHOE: Petition of John W. Fennell Post, No. 110, Grand Army of the Republic, of Grayson, Ky., favoring the construction of war vessels at the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KNAPP: Resolution of Bricklayers' Union No. 73, of Clayton, N. Y., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KYLE: Petition of Plumbers' Union No. 97, in relation to immigration and a Federal election law—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LANDIS: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of James M. Blankenship—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 12328, for the relief of Micajah Powell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 12329, for the relief of David Lindsey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 12324, for the relief of Cora E. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 12322, for the relief of William F. Wilcox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 12327, for the relief of Malissa Griffin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 12323, for the relief of Andrew J. Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 12325, for the relief of Thomas Paul—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 12326, for the relief of John Kirkland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANHAM: Resolution of Evergreen Division, Order of Railway Conductors, Fort Worth, Tex., advocating the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: Resolution of board of aldermen of Boston, Mass., favoring the construction of war vessels in the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LITTAUER: Resolution of Plumbers' Union No. 253, of Gloversville, N. Y., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Petition of Granite Cutters' Union, of St. George, Me., favoring extension of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LONG: Resolutions of Carpenters' Union, Wichita, Kans., urging the enactment of a law restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., urging the passage of House bill 10375, for the survey and construction of a free public wagon road into the Hetch Hetchy Valley and thence into the Yosemite Valley—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., for the construction by the Government of a Pacific cable—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOODY of Oregon: Petitions of citizens of Jordan Valley, Oreg., asking for the enactment of certain land legislation—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MORRIS: Petition of citizens of Duluth, Minn., favoring an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORTON: Resolution of Good Hope Lodge, No. 59, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Bucyrus, Ohio, and Journeymen Barbers' Union No. 263, Sandusky, Ohio, favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Granite Cutters' Union, of Clyde, Ohio, asking for reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to George W. M. Fuller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Ruth Arnold—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Petition of Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen of Terre Haute, Ind., favoring the bill to limit the power of Federal courts in granting injunctions in trade disputes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Resolutions of Plumbers' Union of Fort Wayne, Ind., for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of Division No. 138, Order of Railway Conductors, favoring the bill to limit the power of Federal courts in granting injunctions in trade disputes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODEY: Resolution of the Commercial Club of Omaha, Nebr., in relation to the reclamation and settlement of the arid public domain—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. RUMPLE: Resolutions of Tri-City Bricklayers' Union, No. 7, of Davenport, Iowa, urging the enactment of a Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Resolutions of Typographical Union No. 62, of Utica, N. Y., and Bricklayers' Union No. 73, of Clayton, N. Y., favoring a reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Typographical Union No. 63, Stereotypers' Union, and Butchers' Union No. 13, all of Utica, N. Y., and Barbers' Union No. 168, of Oneonta, N. Y., favoring a further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SIMS: Resolutions of Carpenters and Joiners' Union, of Jackson, Tenn., favoring an educational test in the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of Typographical Union No. 24, of Jackson, Tenn., favoring a reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of the Commercial Club, of Omaha, Nebr., in relation to the leasing of public lands, irrigation, and homesteads—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Great Falls Typographical Union, No. 256, Great Falls, Mont., and Charleston (S. C.) Typographical Union urging the defeat of House bill 5777 and Senate bill 2894, amending the copyright law—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, resolution of American Paper and Pulp Association, for the establishment of a permanent Census Bureau—to the Select Committee on the Census.

By Mr. THOMAS of Iowa: Petition of the American Chamber of Commerce of Manila, for the enactment of laws allowing cooly labor to enter the Philippine Islands under such restrictions and laws as the Philippine Commission may enact—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, resolution of Cerro Gordo Lodge, No. 29, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, Mason City, Iowa, favoring the anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Petition of heirs of Lippman Aaron, late of Duplin County, N. C., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TIRRELL: Resolutions of Carpenters' Union No. 847, of Natick, Mass., favoring the construction of war vessels at the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. VREELAND: Resolutions of Shongo Post, No. 332, Grand Army of the Republic, of New York, and Japanners' Union of Jamestown, N. Y., favoring the construction of war

vessels at the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolution of Typographical Union of Jamestown, N. Y., for the passage of laws which will prevent the immigration of persons who can not read—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of Japanners' Union No. 9069 and Union No. 205, and Barbers' Union No. 178, all of Jamestown, N. Y., in favor of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Resolution of Retail Clerks' Union No. 489, North Tonawanda, N. Y., favoring an educational test in the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of L. D. Waterbury and 38 citizens of Knowlesville and vicinity, New York, in favor of an amendment to the Constitution defining legal marriage to be monogamic, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WARNOCK: Papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to David J. Courter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers in support of House bill 5701, granting an increase of pension to Letty J. Coplin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILEY: Petition of Addie E. Amos, of Conecuh County, Ala., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Petitions of Joseph Shaw Post, No. 235, and G. B. Lee Post, No. 692, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Illinois, for investigation of the administration of the Bureau of Pensions—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 12345 for the relief of Eliza M. Crisell—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WRIGHT: Resolution of Post No. 124, Grand Army of the Republic, East Smithfield, Pa., favoring the construction of war vessels in the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolution of Southern Tier Union, No. 10, Order of Railway Conductors, Sayre, Pa., asking for the passage of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

MONDAY, March 10, 1902.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Friday last, when, on request of Mr. GALLINGER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

OREGON LAND COMPANY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in further response to a resolution of June 7, 1900, relating to the Oregon Land Company, a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office submitting a list of applications presented for lands within the conflicting limits of the forfeited portion of the grant to the Northern Pacific Railroad Company and the grant made to aid in the construction of The Dalles military road, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

SCHOONER FRIENDSHIP.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusions of fact and of law filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the findings by the court relative to the vessel schooner *Friendship*, Samuel Moulton, master; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

DANIEL HEFFLEBOWER.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings filed by the court in the cause of Daniel Hefflebower, executor of Alexander Hefflebower, deceased, v. The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R.

8586) amending the act of March 2, 1901, entitled "An act to carry into effect the stipulations of Article VII of the treaty between the United States and Spain, concluded on the 10th day of December, 1898.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11471) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. HITT, Mr. ADAMS, and Mr. DINSMORE managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had passed with amendments the following bill and joint resolution; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (S. 646) for the purchase or construction of a launch for the customs service at and in the vicinity of Astoria, Oreg.; and A joint resolution (S. R. 21) authorizing the printing of extra copies of the annual report of the Commissioner of Pensions.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 4607) to provide for the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River at or near South Omaha, Nebr.

A bill (H. R. 7458) to re-form the western judicial district of the State of Arkansas.

A bill (H. R. 11306) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at Burlington, Iowa;

A bill (H. R. 11409) to authorize the construction of a traffic bridge across the Savannah River from the mainland within the corporate limits of the city of Savannah to Hutchinsons Island, in the county of Chatham, State of Georgia;

A bill (H. R. 11719) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Pittsburg and Mansfield Railroad Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Monongahela River;"

A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 24) providing for the publication of 99,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of Cattle; and

A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 26) providing for the publication of 200,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of the Horse.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. GALLINGER presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of Littleton, Webster, West Unity, and Rindge, all in the State of New Hampshire, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Bricklayers and Masons' Local Union No. 2, of Portsmouth, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to exclude Chinese laborers from the United States and the insular possessions, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the American Paper and Pulp Association of New York City, praying for the establishment of a permanent census bureau; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Manufacturers' Club of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the President of the United States to appoint a commission to study and make a full report upon the commercial and industrial conditions of China and Japan; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I present the memorial of G. A. Karwiese, civil and consulting engineer, of Louisville, Ky., relative to the advantages of the Aputi route for the Isthmian canal to connect the Atlantic and Pacific oceans. I move that the memorial be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLACKBURN presented a petition of Local Union No. 681, United Mine Workers of America, of Mercer Station, Ky., praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. HARRIS presented petitions of Federal Labor Union No. 8450, of Independence; of Local Union No. 597, of Scammon; of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 36, of Topeka; of the Industrial Council of Pittsburg; of Stationary Engineers' Local Union No. 75, of Coffeyville, and of Local Union No. 293, of Parsons, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of Kansas, praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Pittsburg, Neutral, Ogallah, Emporia, Council Grove, Russell, St. Marys, Mankato, Dunlap, Louisburg, Freeport, Merriam, Dundee, Wells-ville, Columbus, Hackney, Dunavant, Fort Scott, Lawrence, Mound City, Arkansas City, Home City, Abilene, and Brantford, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation